

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



**Jerome's text of the gospels, the 'Vetus Latina', and the 'Vulgate'  
With comparative tables of Jerome's text of Matthew and Mark**

Dooley, Timothy William

*Awarding institution:*  
King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

**END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT**



**Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page** this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**JEROME'S TEXT OF THE GOSPELS,  
THE '*VETUS LATINA*', AND THE  
'VULGATE': WITH COMPARATIVE  
TABLES OF JEROME'S TEXT OF  
*MATTHEW* AND *MARK***

---

*Submitted in fulfillment of the degree*

*Doctor of Philosophy in Theology and Religious Studies*

*King's College London*

*Timothy W. Dooley*

## **Dedication**

To Lily  
The Dooley Family  
The Belhadia Family  
and Markus Vinzent

Without whom this work would not have been possible.

And to the memory of Paul B. Harvey, Jr.

Who first introduced me to Jerome.

ABSTRACT	6
CHAPTER 1	7
INTRODUCTION : VETUS LATINA AND VULGATE	7
INTRODUCTION	7
‘VETUS LATINA’	9
VULGATE	16
CHAPTER 2	35
LATINIZATION, DAMASUS, AND JEROME	35
DAMASUS	35
JEROME	42
CHAPTER 3	44
THE ROMAN WORKS	44
EPISTLE 22	45
AGAINST HELVIDIUS	50
PREFACE TO THE VULGATE GOSPELS	55
CHAPTER 4	59
TEXT AND COMPARISONS: THE ROMAN WORKS	59
GOSPEL CITATIONS IN EPISTLE 22 (383-4 CE)	59
MATTHEW	59
MARK	60
LUKE	61
JOHN	61
JEROME’S VULGATE INTRODUCTION TO THE GOSPELS	62
LATIN WITH INTERLINEAR ENGLISH TRANSLATION	62
CHAPTER 5	69
THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW: JEROME’S COMMENTARY	69
BACKGROUND	69
THE CREATION OF THE COMMENTARY	74
MATTHEW 3:9 POTENS EST V. POTEST	77
MATTHEW 4:5 ADSUMPSIT/ADSUMIT & PINNAM/PINNACULUM	79
MATTHEW 5:25	80
MATTHEW 6:16 EXTERMINANT V. DEMOLIUNTUR	81
MATTHEW 6:27 COGITANS	82
MATTHEW 6:34	83
MATTHEW 7:15 UESTITU...INTUS V. UESTIMENTIS...INTRINSECUS	84
MATTHEW 8:7 SANABO V. CURABO	85
MATTHEW 8:9	86
MATTHEW 8:14 FEBRIENTEM V. FEBRICITANTEM	87
MATTHEW 8:20 NIDOS V. TABERNACULA	88
MATTHEW 10:5 AMBULAUERITIS V. ABIERITIS	89
MATTHEW 10:10 IN MANU	91
MATTHEW 14:6 TRICLINIO	92
MATTHEW 15:6	93

<i>MATTHEW 15:11 COMMUNICAT V. COINQUINAT</i>	93
<i>MATTHEW 15:24 PERDITAS V. QUAE PERIERUNT</i>	96
<i>MATTHEW 19:14</i>	97
<i>MATTHEW 19:24-26</i>	98
<i>MATTHEW 21:9 EXCELSIS V. ALTISSIMIS</i>	100
<i>MATTHEW 21:40 COLONIS V. AGRICOLIS</i>	101
<i>MATTHEW 22:5-6</i>	102
<i>MATTHEW 22:34</i>	102
<i>MATTHEW 23:35 QUI OCCISUS EST V. QUEM OCCIDISTIS</i>	103
<i>MATTHEW 24:1-2</i>	103
<i>MATTHEW 24:7-8</i>	104
<i>MATTHEW 26:46</i>	105
<i>MATTHEW 27:46</i>	106
NOTABLE EXCEPTIONS	108
<i>MATTHEW 6:11 SUPERSUBSTANTIALEM</i>	108
<i>MATTHEW 10:18</i>	113
<i>MATTHEW 14:35</i>	114
<i>MATTHEW 17:22</i>	115
<i>MATTHEW 21:44, A STUMBLING STONE</i>	117
GRAMMATICAL DIFFERENCES	118
GREEK ΕΙΣ +ACCUSATIVE	119
CONCLUSIONS: JEROME'S EDITION OF <i>MATTHEW</i>	121
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>THE GOSPEL OF MARK: JEROME'S HOMILIES</b>	<b>125</b>
<i>MARK 1:6 TRACTATUS 1A.90 AND 1B.3</i>	129
<i>MARK 1:17 TRACTATUS 1.105</i>	130
<i>MARK 5:41 MIHI V. TIBI, TRACTATUS 3.68</i>	131
<i>MARK 5:43 TRACTATUS 3.87</i>	132
<i>MARK 8:1-2 TRACTATUS 4.1</i>	133
<i>MARK 8:24 SUSPICIENS V. ASPICIENS, TRACTATUS 5.80</i>	135
<i>MARK 9:2, TRACTATUS 6.138</i>	136
<i>MARK 9:5, TRACTATUS 6.73</i>	139
<i>MARK 11:14 DICIT V. DIXIT AND MANDUCABIT V. MANDUCET, TRACTATUS 8.139</i>	141
<i>MARK 11:16 DIMITTEBAT V. SINEBAT, TRACTATUS 11.84</i>	142
<i>MARK 14:3 UNGUENTI PISTICI V. UNGUENTI NARDI SPICATI, TRACTATUS 10.51</i>	143
CONCLUSION	144
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>TEXT COMPARISONS</b>	<b>146</b>
TABLE 1:	146
JEROME'S TEXT OF <i>MATTHEW: COMMENTARY ON MATTHEW</i>	146
TABLE 2: JEROME'S LATEST TEXT OF <i>MATTHEW: COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH</i>	204
TABLE 3:	206
JEROME'S TEXT OF MARK: <i>HOMILIES ON MARK</i>	206
INCIDENTALS	216
<b>CHAPTER 8</b>	<b>220</b>
<b>VULGATE PAUL AND PELAGIUS</b>	<b>220</b>
MARCIONITE PREFACES V. <i>PQ</i>	222
THE <i>PQ</i> FORMULA	226

MARCION V. <i>PRIMUM QUAERITUR</i>	228
RUFINUS AND PELAGIAN POSSIBILITIES	242
<b>CHAPTER 9</b>	<b>245</b>
<b>AFTERWORD</b>	<b>245</b>
TWO OPTIONS	249
A SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS	251
JEROME'S FINAL PROJECT	254
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>259</b>
PRIMARY LITERATURE	259
GREEK NEW TESTAMENT	259
VULGATE	259
VETUS LATINA	259
PATRISTIC SOURCES	259
AMBROSE	259
AUGUSTINE	260
JEROME	261
SECONDARY LITERATURE	262

## Abstract

The Vulgate is a collection of Latin translations from *Genesis* to *Revelation*, and its name defines its central function: a common translation into a single language for wider dissemination among the faithful. However, its status as a Latin Scriptural translation is far from unique; it is joined by a great number of extra-Vulgate works called *Vetus Latina*, Old Latin. The Vulgate collection's rise to prominence is primarily owed to its tradition. This tradition states that the Dalmatian exegete and monk Jerome of Stridon completed the Vulgate initially by order of his patron Pope Damasus. This original commission included the four Gospels at first and was completed in the early 380's. The complete Vulgate collection would at first be attributed to Jerome who himself had claimed such completion. Throughout Ecclesiastical History, the attribution of the majority of the Vulgate New Testament has diminished to a scholarly consensus that Jerome completed only the Vulgate Gospels. It is this final certitude that this dissertation explores. Through a close examination of verifiable Hieronymian witness of the Gospels, especially *Matthew* and *Mark*, an evaluation of Jerome as a witness to the Vulgate Gospels is presented.

To evaluate Jerome as witness for the Vulgate may at first appear to be a counterintuitive approach; Jerome's involvement with the formation of the Vulgate is has been traditionally considered inextricably linked to the story of the Vulgate. This dissertation provides reevaluation of the historical division between *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate. This overview of the two Latin traditions is presented in the introduction. The next chapter examines sources and events surrounding the Latinization of the church in the Fourth Century. In this context, this dissertation examines the pontificate of Damasus and his relation to the exegete Jerome. Next, Jerome's literary creations from

his Roman period in contact with Damasus are evaluated. This is followed by an evaluation of the citations in *Epistle 22* and an original interlinear translation of Jerome's preface to his Gospel translations. The following two chapters present analysis of the *Commentary on Matthew* and the *Homilies on Mark*, respectively. An exhaustive comparative table of Jerome's text, the Vulgate, and *Vetus Latina* examples follows each chapter. Following this presentation of Jerome's *Matthew* and *Mark*, a discussion of the possibilities of Vulgate Paul's editor is presented. This leads to some suggestions that serve as a call to reconsider the traditional history and rebuild the understanding of the Vulgate based on deductive considerations of extra-Vulgate translations and Patristic citations.

## Chapter 1

### Introduction : *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate

#### Introduction

This thesis traces the lineage back to its original source of what is conventionally called the 'Latin Vulgate', namely 'the Latin Bible that has been in common use in the Western Church since the seventh century'.<sup>1</sup> In doing so, it seeks to better understand the veiled history of its creation. It critically observes the traditional source, Jerome of Stridon, in an attempt to shed light on its otherwise obscured creation. This is accomplished through the careful observation of Hieronymian (that is, by Jerome) quotations culled from his numerous epistles, polemical and exegetical works, and translations and commentaries.

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, *Biblia Sacra Vulgata, editio quinta* (1994), XXXIII.



The thesis can be classified into four major sections. The first section is found below in this introductory chapter. This introduction sets the history of the Vulgate in the perspective of those extra-Vulgate Latin translations, known as the *Vetus Latina*. It seeks to make sense of the confusing history of Latin Scriptural history and calls upon a number of prior scholarly monographs. It explores problems throughout history in understanding the true point of origination of the Vulgate and delineates its historical treatment. The second section introduces Pope Damasus, the Latinization of the Church, and Jerome's works in Rome. As such, it seeks to capture some picture of the scholar's early inclinations and understand from the onset if he uses any uniquely identifiable translations; to accomplish this, some of his Roman works are considered. The third part then analyzes Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew* and *Homilies on Mark* in order to understand whether or not Jerome's numerous citations bear witness to the Vulgate translation. The fourth part of the dissertation posits possibilities on the production of the Vulgate Epistles and makes inferences on the later early period of the Vulgate's collation. A number of tables are interspersed that give a fuller comparison of the relationship between the text of Jerome, the Vulgate, and the *Vetus Latina* tradition. These tables include hundreds of citations of Jerome's text of the Gospels set in parallel with the Vulgate<sup>2</sup> and, where appropriate, a selection of various other Latin examples from *Vetus Latina* manuscripts. Also included is an original interlinear translation of the Vulgate preface to the Gospels that is used in the discussion of Jerome's Roman period.

The following introductory chapter is concerned with definitions of *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate. It contains summaries of the attempts by the very best and brightest scholars in the field of Biblical Textual Criticism to make sense of a preponderance of Latin manuscripts of the Bible. As the summaries will show, such attempts at definition

---

<sup>2</sup> The typical Vulgate text employed by this dissertation, unless otherwise explicitly stated or cited from a specific manuscript, is the Stuttgart edition of Robert Weber, Roger Gryson, et al., *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. 5 (Stuttgart, 2007). This work will be variably referenced as both the 'Stuttgart Edition' and 'Weber-Gryson'.

reap results that are far from definitive. They are furthermore based upon the tradition of Jerome and his central role in the creation of the Vulgate. As with all definitions, they require a certain set of widely accepted preconceptions to build a new understanding of a topic. It should become readily apparent that many of the layers of our definitions are themselves rather weak and fall upon closer criticism. Regardless, an attempt at understanding the history of the Latin Bible, especially the New Testament, will form a backbone reference from which to build our study of the Vulgate's creation.

### **'Vetus Latina'**

In order to properly lay out a schematic approach to identifying the Vulgate tradition, an understanding of extra-Vulgate Latin editions is necessary. The *Vetus Latina*, that is Old Latin, versions of the Bible are primarily understood by the sense that their categorical name gives them. Essentially, the standard line in scholarship is that the *Vetus Latina* consisted of a number of primal manuscripts from which the Vulgate of Jerome emerged in its ambition to correct the 'limitations and imperfections of the Old Latin versions'.<sup>3</sup> It was the old corpus from which Jerome set about 'correcting mistranslations, substituting occasionally as foundation better Greek MSS than those at the back of the Old Latin, and purifying the Latinity to a more cultured standard.'<sup>4</sup> The important foundational work of Souter and the updated scholarship of Metzger both set the paradigm as Old Latin versus Vulgate. It is this negative definition, that is, defining Vulgate by what it is not, that has formed and set the tone of the dichotomy by which we view Vulgate and other.<sup>5</sup> While this method conveniently slots innumerable

---

<sup>3</sup> Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (1913), 48.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Such a view features in virtually every full consideration of Latin New Testament manuscript traditions. See especially, Souter, *Text and Canon* (1913), Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (1964/2005) which can be seen as the successor to Souter's work. Both consider each phenomenon, *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate, as separate and necessary to the existence of the other. They receive complementary and successive treatments. The same can be said of all the scholarly volumes listed in this dissertation. See

manuscripts into two neat boxes, there are a number of issues that arise from such a sorting. The primary concern of the present discussion, namely what is Vulgate and to what extent is it Jerome's, causes a critical problem with this set-up. If doubt can reasonably be placed upon the Vulgate, the definition of *Vetus Latina* circularly turns in upon itself as its reference point is diminished.

A Church that read less and less Greek required the formation of the Latin translations. In the succinct summation of Knust, 'Latin translations gradually become the norm in regions where Latin was becoming the reigning *lingua franca*'.<sup>6</sup> For Souter, Christianity's spread from the 'middle class' (which he somewhat suspiciously claims 'is always of higher morality and not infrequently of better education than the other classes of society') to the lower, Latin-only classes, necessitated the translation of the Eastern Greek into the common Latin tongue.<sup>7</sup> Turner remarks on the 'very slow stages' upon which 'the Latinization of the Roman Church made way' to 'private venture(s) of individual Roman Christians' to create Latin translations of the Scripture that were not 'anything like an official version; not a version read in church so much as a version studied at home'.<sup>8</sup> The impetus for such translations would not begin at Rome but in Northern Africa, Carthage, where Latin was already the language of the cultivated middle class.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the African family of manuscripts first arose to fulfill a linguistic need. Given the African manuscripts' built-to-order nature for disparate, non-centralized Christian communities, their content is seldom consistent. The European class of manuscripts, on the other hand, arose later for the usage of an exclusively Latin speaking 'class' and demonstrate a greater diversity. It is important to also emphasize

---

also, J.K. Elliott, 'The Translations of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and Vulgate', *ANRW* II.26.1 (1992) in its entirety, especially 200-202.

<sup>6</sup> J.W. Knust, 'New Testament, Latin Translations of', *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, edd. R.S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen, C.B. Champion, A. Erskine, and S. R. Huebner (2013) 4769.

<sup>7</sup> Alexander Souter, *Text and Canon* (1913), 34.

<sup>8</sup> Cuthbert H. Turner, *The Oldest Manuscript of the Vulgate Gospels* (1931), xi-xiii.

<sup>9</sup> Souter (1913), 35; Turner (1931), xiii.

the pre-Damasus crawl toward a re-Latinisation of the Roman Church that can be demonstrated in the precipitation of European Latin translation. Whether more confidence is placed on Burkitt (who saw the European text as a ‘degeneration’ of the African predecessors)<sup>10</sup> or von Soden (who saw the African and European texts as distinct creations)<sup>11</sup> the European texts are indubitably important in their own right and demonstrate a ‘fundamental unity’.<sup>12</sup> Elliott’s more recent theory also bears mentioning; he suggests that a clear division between ‘Africa’ and ‘Europe’ is a specious division.<sup>13</sup> Regardless whether one supports the ‘degeneration’ or unique formation of the two families, or rejects the reality of the division as in Elliott’s model, the traditional terms are useful for characterising and compartmentalising the myriad *Vetus Latina* manuscripts. This will be especially apparent in the following discussion on Jerome’s commentary on *Matthew* and homilies on *Mark*.

Augustine famously remarked on the ceaseless creation of these old translations as countless due to the popular belief that almost anyone who had some facility in both Latin and Greek could forge their own translation.<sup>14</sup> This hubris led to fragmentary productions of manuscripts, of which we have no complete Bible, let alone New Testament, and a number of palimpsests.<sup>15</sup> Brown summarizes the history of the Old Latin manuscripts as ‘extremely confused and unclear’.<sup>16</sup> Thus, a clearly delineated history of those non-Vulgate texts is difficult to attain. It is important to emphasize that this piecemeal production was never in its time considered a unique entity, nor was such

---

<sup>10</sup> Francis C. Burkitt, *Texts and Studies*, 4.3: *The Old Latin and the Itala* (1896), 15.

<sup>11</sup> Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1907), 1545-50.

<sup>12</sup> Souter (1913), 40. The above Burkitt and von Soden citations are also summarized here by Souter.

<sup>13</sup> J.K. Elliott, ‘The Translations of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate’, *ANRW* II.26.1 (1992) 200-2.

<sup>14</sup> Augustine, *De Doc.* 2.16; See also Metzger’s discussion and translation of this passage in *The Bible in Translation* (2001), 13.

<sup>15</sup> Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome* (1992), 98. J.K. Elliot, ‘The Translations of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate’, *ANRW* II.26.1, (1992) 203-212.

<sup>16</sup> Brown (1992) 98.

copious production done with a sense of editorial cohesion. Rather, the various efforts, whether unique or derivative, only became a 'superfamily' after the Vulgate was considered a unique phenomenon.

The designation of 'old' is itself a misleading adjective. It presupposes a clean transition from an era of vapid and inexact Latin translation to an era of Hieronymian cleansing through which a superior and Vatican endorsed Latinity could flourish. Souter commented on the fact that Jerome himself used 'vulgata' to discuss known Latin texts in his time, a fact expounded upon by Bogaert who stated that even 'the term [Vulgate] is anachronistic.'<sup>17</sup> Knust describes the dissemination of myriad texts alongside texts called 'Vulgate' as 'unstable; Older Latin translations circulated alongside those attributed to Jerome, sometimes on their own and sometimes as mixed texts, even within a single Gospel book.'<sup>18</sup> The antiquity of the *Vetus Latina* MSS does not necessarily surpass that of those associated with the Vulgate. Our oldest and best available *Vetus Latina* manuscript, the *Codex Vercellensis* (a), was likely written sometime at the end of the fourth century. On the other hand, our oldest copy of the Vulgate Gospels, *Codex Sangallensis* (Σ), was written about a century later at the close of the fifth century. However, a fuller chronology reveals a tangled web of coexistence of the two manuscript traditions. The important bilingual Greek and Latin *Codex Bezae* (d) of the *Vetus Latina* tradition is from the late fifth or sixth century, whereas the intricately ornate Lindisfarne Gospels (Y) represent the Vulgate tradition in the early eighth century. Indeed, examples could be formed to weave in and out of the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* tradition, especially up to the exceptionally late *Vetus Latina* *Codex Colbertinus* (c) of the twelfth century. Such definitions of 'old' and 'new'/Vulgate require some acquiescence to an orderly paradigm in which that which is

---

<sup>17</sup> P.-M. Bogaert, 'The Latin Bible c. 600 to c. 900', *The New Cambridge History of the Bible from 600 to 1450* (2002), 69.

<sup>18</sup> J.W. Knust, 'New Testament, Latin Translations of' (2013) 4769.

more purely Hieronymian is considered more Vulgate, and that which is ‘other’ more closely follows the *Vetus Latina*, non-Vulgate tradition. Thus, Old Latin is not necessarily older, nor is it simply defined without reference to its Vulgate foil. The inverse must also be true, insofar as the Vulgate tradition cannot be fully understood without a study of the *Vetus Latina* traditions that preceded it.

Furthermore, the fundamental nature of these translations as bespoke works for local consumption contrasts directly with the story of the Latin Vulgate. The Vulgate is primarily significant if it is a distinct creature commissioned by the central Roman Church authority, the Pope, and produced by a renowned scholar and later saint. The *Vetus Latina* is a catch-all term to describe various individual efforts at relaying the Scripture in Latin. Thus, the *Vetus Latina* includes the unofficial efforts at Latin translation, which is in effect, another way to say that which is not Vulgate.

In his *The Old Latin Gospels*, Philip Burton presents a ‘cumulative’ set of variations among Old Latin treatments of Greek words to reach ‘provisional’ conclusions for such different treatments.<sup>19</sup> None of the variants in *Matthew* and *Mark* scrutinised in this dissertation are considered in Burton’s summaries of cumulative variations among *VL* texts and the Vulgate.<sup>20</sup> This is not meant to be an argument *ex silentio* that this dissertation provides more data previously ignored by important studies. Rather, I seek to emphasise the importance of patristic evidence in evaluating textual variants: where one translation from Greek into Latin may seem consistent over a wide array of *VL* and Vulgate examples, the consideration of contemporaneous Patristic sources may shed light on a translation’s adoption outside of the evidence provided by Latin Gospel manuscripts.

---

<sup>19</sup> Philip Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels* (2000) 35-36.

<sup>20</sup> Burton (2000) 32-48.

The importance of Latin Patristic evidence in the evaluation of variants is summarised succinctly by H.A.G. Houghton:

The earliest Latin Christian authors are comparable in antiquity both to their Greek counterparts and to many of the oldest surviving New Testament manuscripts. They offer insights into the biblical texts of the third and fourth centuries, using translations which may even reach back a century earlier. Furthermore, although all versional evidence is to some extent patristic because it is mediated by a translator, in the Latin tradition the evidence of the Church Fathers is accorded special priority. The supersession of the initial Latin translations by the version which later became known as the Vulgate means that few of the Old Latin (*Vetus Latina*) texts are transmitted in biblical codices. Instead, these versions must usually be pieced together from quotations in the Latin Fathers. Patristic writings also offer geographical and chronological information that may serve to locate the forms of text found in surviving manuscripts.<sup>21</sup>

Importantly, Houghton expresses the interdependence of Latin translations and the Patristic sources which interacted with them. The salient observation that 'all versional evidence is to some extent patristic because it is mediated by a translator' is critical to understand the approach of this dissertation. Through an observation of Jerome's citations of Matthew and Mark, I approach possible new variants as phenomena of their patristic interaction and potential evidence of forms to be found outside of extant *VL* forms.

J.-C. Haelewyck suggests the importance of criticism of patristic sources to be two-fold. First, the Fathers often provide a unique text of the *VL* otherwise not found. Second, the citations of the Fathers allow the scholar to precisely date and locate variants that would otherwise be 'very difficult to situate geographically and chronologically if they were not transmitted through the manuscripts'.<sup>22</sup> This study

---

<sup>21</sup> H.A.G. Houghton 'The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, edd. B.D. Ehrman and M.W. Holmes (2012) 375.

<sup>22</sup> J.-C. Haelewyck, 'Les premières versions latines de la bible', *Les premières traditions de la bible*, edd. C.-B. Amphoux and J. Margain (1996) 122-123.

interacts with both valuable contributions. At times, Jerome's text of Matthew and Mark displays variants considered by this dissertation to either be sufficiently rare or themselves unique. The implications of such variants are discussed at length when mentioned. However, as Burton cautions, so too must this evidence be considered 'cumulative' to arrive at 'working hypotheses to account for' these variations.<sup>23</sup>

Further caution is also required. Where Jerome can be demonstrated as having a 'unique' tradition compared to known *VL* and Vulgate traditions, further *argumenta ex silentio* to suggest these differences were consciously chosen or hand-crafted by Jerome are simply assumptions. Jerome's storied role as a great translator may lead to the conclusion that unique variants are his choices, whether prior to the citation's creation or in the process of writing the work in which he is citing. However, Jerome's archetype must not cloud our judgment of his citations. Rather, Haelewyck's second important designation may be at work; Jerome may be providing a landmark of the introduction of a variant he had adopted from some other source. However, where the evidence may bear out such assumption that Jerome had potentially preferred or used a unique translation into Latin, this dissertation will make particular note. For example, Jerome's career-long preference for the *VL* and liturgical *excelsis* rather than the Vulgate *altissimis* in *Matthew* 21:9 might be suggestive of disassociation with the Vulgate tradition.

It is then through a matter of convention that I will call the traditions extra-Vulgate *Vetus Latina*. My purposeful obfuscation of Old Latin behind its Latin name is a small attempt to distance it from the baggage that attends this English designation. If convention did not compel us to use this cumbersome designation, a simple appellation of non-Vulgate would strike closer to the truth, but still fall short. In setting up any

---

<sup>23</sup> Burton (2000) 35-6.



sorting boxes, no matter the label they carry, we implicitly provide for a much neater manuscript history than evidence itself could provide. The following discussion on Vulgate definition thus summarizes the Vulgate Problem by discussing the traditional history. The thesis will develop throughout the work, but can be boiled-down in saying that the Vulgate is as loosely defined as the *Vetus Latina*, and of all its uncertainties, the strongest I seek to demonstrate is the uncertainty of its original creation. If then the sorting box of Vulgate is cast into doubt, the other pile of non-Vulgate *Vetus Latina* becomes so full that its efficacy in describing the history of the Latin New Testament is diminished.

## Vulgate

The significance of the Vulgate upon the development of Western civilization is incalculably large. Its reception imprinted its Latinity upon innumerable grammarians and schoolchildren alike through the Middle Ages. Its importance was summarized succinctly – if rather glowingly – by F.J.E. Raby in his work on Christian Latin Poetry:

The medieval world begins with Augustine and Jerome, with the *De Civitate Dei* and the Vulgate. The one contained in outline the theory of the medieval Church, which was being constructed on the ruins of the Western Empire; the other finally provided the liturgical and to a large extent the ecclesiastical language of Latin Christianity.<sup>24</sup>

Raby homes in on the immense influence of Vulgate Latin upon developing Latin literature. ‘The language of the Vulgate gathers up the various influences which had been at work in creating the appropriate medium for the expression of Christian thought in the West,’ he states and continues with a focus on the Vulgate’s legendary author:

Jerome indeed owed much to his unknown predecessors who had based their versions on the Septuagint and had introduced along with Hellenic elements the flavour of the Vulgate tongue... New rhythms appeared, a new and more romantic imagery... in which the Catholic emotion was to discover its final expression. It is the music of a new

---

<sup>24</sup> F.J.E. Raby, *A History of Christian Latin Poetry* (1927), 74.

world, for out of it appeared at last, when its religious mission had been fulfilled, the romantic poetry of the modern world.<sup>25</sup>

This is an evocative summation of the importance of the Vulgate Bible to the evolution of Western culture. But it also demonstrates the degree of effusive grandiloquence and somewhat monolithic perception with which scholarship has treated the Vulgate tradition. There is no doubt that the Vulgate was so centrally important for Latin literature, religious and secular, but the force with which it is commended finds citation primarily in secondary and tertiary sources. What follows in this chapter, and furthermore this dissertation as a whole, is an attempt to push beyond the hagiographical attributions for the Vulgate and reliance on manuscript history in order to discover more about the Vulgate's initial creation. I will demonstrate the various historiographical treatments of the Vulgate's history and wish to present these works not as supporting evidence for this history, but rather as an appraisal of the historiography of the Vulgate Bible, especially as it pertains to the Gospels.

This study relies heavily on the extraction of patristic citations of the Vulgate tradition in order to better understand its adoption. The adoption of the tradition by Jerome himself is of primary concern. And yet, patristic evidence for the adoption of Vulgate Gospel forms does not appear consistently until a significant time after Jerome's career. As presented by H.A.G. Houghton in his recent update to *The Text of the New Testament's* chapter on 'The Use of the Latin Fathers', the earliest potential presentation of Vulgate forms was the rare usage in Augustine's text of John in the early fifth century.<sup>26</sup> 'The revision of the Gospels by Jerome and the rest of the New Testament took some time to be established,' with the writers Petrus Chrysologus and Arnobius given as evidence of continued *Vetus Latina* usage throughout the fifth

---

<sup>25</sup> op. cit. 10-1.

<sup>26</sup> H.A.G. Houghton, 'The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism', *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, edd. B.D. Ehrman and M.W. Holmes (2012) 375-405, here 383.

century.<sup>27</sup> Further, Houghton notes 'in the seventh and eighth centuries, exegetical works continue to be a source of Old Latin readings, usually in quotations of earlier authors by learned commentators such as Alcuin or Bede.'<sup>28</sup> Here, Bogaert's point is directly illustrated: that which is now Vulgate was not until after the ninth century vulgate, or common.<sup>29</sup> Rather, the Gospel tradition later called Vulgate by Trent in the 16<sup>th</sup> century was still in the process of proving itself common to Christendom.

Before we turn our focus to a historiographical consideration of the Vulgate tradition, it is important first to establish a definition of this tradition. As will be discussed further in the following discussion of Damasus and Jerome, the Vulgate is the official Roman Catholic endorsed Latin translation of Scripture. As intimated above in the *Vetus Latina* discussion, its official history places it as a singular work of translation (at least in the Gospels) of Jerome of Stridon as compelled and commissioned by Pope Damasus in the early 380's. Jerome wrote a letter-cum-introduction to his work to Damasus (as discussed in a following chapter on his Roman works) to introduce the following 'pious work, but dangerous presumption'<sup>30</sup>. The work, in the eyes of Jerome, was dangerously presumptuous given the copious amount of already extant Latin

---

<sup>27</sup> Houghton (2012) 383-384.

<sup>28</sup> Houghton (2012) 384-385.

<sup>29</sup> Bogaert (1988) 142-3.

<sup>30</sup> I have here, and throughout this work, chosen to translate *praesumptio* as presented in the *Preface* as 'presumption'. Andrew Cain in his *Jerome's Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae*, (2013) 421-2 presents a study of Jerome's usage of the latin word. In 26.2 of the *Epitaph*, Cain comments that Jerome's *id est a praesumptione pessimo praeceptore* suggests 'obstinacy' and also adds that Jerome displays a certain fondness for the word in alliterative constructions, such as here in the *Preface*. The sense of obstinacy is latent in the *Preface*'s use, while not entirely accurate. Jerome is here 'disavow[ing] such pride in himself' (Cain 2013, 422) so as to suggest humility in his significant undertaking. I use 'presumption' in the context of the exegete demonstrating (feigned or otherwise) this very sense of humility to the Bishop of Rome.

attempts, many of which had been widely distributed throughout Western Christendom.<sup>31</sup>

This brief summary of Vulgate history will be recapitulated at length throughout this dissertation. At present, however, I seek to introduce the Vulgate apart from its presumed origination story and seek to understand the tradition as a textual phenomenon. In view of the discussion above on the *Vetus Latina*, it is important to understand the Vulgate as a historical text which itself defines the rest of Latin efforts.

An understanding of the Vulgate tradition must necessarily be built upon its relative similarities to and differences with the manuscripts of the *Vetus Latina* tradition. The intermingling of both traditions, however, presents a number of difficulties in identifying distinct branches of difference. The extent to which Jerome was influenced by the *Vetus Latina* (as evidenced in the analysis to follow) is certain. And, whether the Vulgate's originator was Jerome or not, it is certain that the Vulgate's origin necessarily relied on the available *Vetus Latina* manuscripts. Pierre-Maurice Bogaert summarises the problem as such:

The border between Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* is especially apparent when it distinguishes a version of St. Jerome in Hebrew and the ancient version corresponding to the Greek. In this case, the genius of the Hebrew and the style of Jerome converge to give a version of which the vocabulary and the syntax distance themselves clearly from the diverse forms of the *Vetus Latina*, almost completely, literally faithful to the Greek. Otherwise, in the New Testament and in the Greek books of the Old Testament, it does as such only in revisions. Even the touch of Jerome (Gospels, Hexaplar Psalter) is able to be invisible, especially in a short passage. Even more so, the most discrete revisions that are at the origin of the Vulgate of other books are not

---

<sup>31</sup> As Cornelia Linde summarises Jerome's approach 'Why not, he asked, go back to the original to correct what had been corrupted through mistranslation or faulty emendation... But Jerome was keen to stress that his revision of the Gospels was by no means a new translation, and that it did not diverge very much from the customary text', *How to Correct the Sacra Scriptura*, (2012) 31. Jerome's hedge is clear in his language, and I have here chosen to translate *praesumptio* as 'presumption' for the reasons given in fn. 30, above.

perceptible except in rather long pieces at the price of exact analysis. We ought to keep in mind, the version which became 'Vulgate' was not such at its beginning, for each book or group of books, even a version among the others, and the contaminations have played a role in every sense.<sup>32</sup>

For Bogaert, while Jerome's influence on the Old Testament Vulgate is attestable through a great body of evidence, 'the touch of Jerome is able to be invisible, especially in a short passage'.<sup>33</sup>

The history of the Vulgate has been framed as one reliant on the input of Jerome but necessarily beginning sometime after the life of the saint. Specifically, Bogaert states that this history 'only begins with St. Jerome. And to understand his success, the Sixto-Clementine of 1592, the whole course of the Middle Ages must be followed.'<sup>34</sup> In his more recent article 'The Latin Bible, c. 600 to c. 900' in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible* (2012) Bogaert asserts this point more directly when he says that 'the word 'Vulgate' (*vulgata*) is not the most appropriate way to refer to the translations of the Bible by Jerome. First, the term is anachronistic...Second, it is ambiguous...Third, the term is misleading.'<sup>35</sup> The anachronism, he explains, is due to the popular usage of 'Vulgate' only after Trent and more broadly its product, the Sixto-Clementine Bible. And while Jerome may have appreciated any of his work being granted the approbation of a 'common' standard, he himself would not have used the term for anything he produced. Herein lies the ambiguity: a 'common' Vulgate version of the Bible to a

---

<sup>32</sup> Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, 'La Bible latine des origines au moyen âge', *Revue théologique de Louvain* (1988), 137-159, here 140. Echoed twenty-four years later in English in Bogaert 'The Latin Bible, c. 600 to c. 900', *The New Cambridge History of the Bible* (2012), 71: '[There was] contamination on a large scale. This process was operative both within the translations (and commentaries) of Jerome and between his translations and the Old Latin versions, as well as, above all, among the various available forms of the biblical books that Jerome did not touch or (in the case of the gospels) only slightly revised.'

<sup>33</sup> Bogaert (1988), 140.

<sup>34</sup> Bogaert (1988), 140. 'L'histoire de la Vulgate ne fait donc que commencer avec saint Jérôme. Et pour comprendre son aboutissement, la Bible Sixto-Clémentine de 1592, il faut la suivre tout au cours du moyen-âge.'

<sup>35</sup> Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, 'The Latin Bible, c. 600 to c. 900', *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, edd. R. Marsden and E. A. Matter, (2013) 69-92, here 69. Other recent histories include J.K. Elliott, *A Survey of Manuscripts Used in Editions of the Greek New Testament*, (1987) Appendix II, 259-81; J.K. Elliott, 'The Translations of the New Testament into Latin: the Old Latin and the Vulgate', *ANRW* II.26.1 (1992) 198-245; D.C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (2008) esp. 327.

fourth century Christian would be what we now call *Vetus Latina*. It is only in the context of the sixteenth century Council of Trent and the intervening twelve centuries from the life of Jerome that the collection of approved Tridentine Latin translations could be considered *vulgata*. Here, too, is where we find the imprecision which Bogaert calls ‘misleading’: as he notes, even Alcuin’s ninth century revision –indubitably ‘Vulgate’- was hardly ‘common’ during his time.

Bogaert sets forth an appraisal of the state of Vulgate scholarship in his 1988 ‘La bible latine’.<sup>36</sup> In it, he orients the course of modern scholarship from the seminal work of Samuel Berger in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. At the time of his writing, Bogaert laments that the ‘Latin Bible is not studied but in a few centers’.<sup>37</sup> Curiously he considers the ‘critical edition of the Vulgate of the New Testament’ to be the Wordsworth and White Oxford edition (1954), and not his more contemporary third edition of Weber and Gryson (ed. 1, 1969; ed. 3, 1984). Notably, Bogaert’s ‘critical version’ lacks the prefatory material to which this dissertation will turn to on occasion to establish Jerome’s role in the creation of the Vulgate tradition.

Bogaert provides a succinct summary of the Latin Bible’s history, which he puts in ‘three phases’: ‘the translation into Latin of the Greek Bible, the translations of St. Jerome, the progressive composition of a Latin Bible in the dominant Hieronymian style that, since the 9<sup>th</sup> century would become the creation of the *vulgate*, and, at the beginning the 16<sup>th</sup> century would be called *Vulgate*. Between the second and third phases, it would be useful to insert a report on the modification of the exterior aspect of the Bibles between the 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries. Form and content, neither neglecting the other, act on one another.’<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Bogaert (1988), 141. What follows is a summary of his appraisal.

<sup>37</sup> *ibid*, ‘A l’heure qu’il est, la Bible latine n’est étudiée que dans quelques centres.’

<sup>38</sup> Bogaert (1988), 142-3. The minuscule and majuscule vulgate and Vulgate are purposeful uses by Bogaert to differentiate between a common tradition and a latter appellation of Vulgate.

It is useful here to document the renewed interest in the identification of the Vulgate tradition that began in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Specifically, the work of Samuel Berger in France<sup>39</sup> and John Chapman in England<sup>40</sup> set forth a number of scholarly enquiries that led to Bogaert's 1988 assessment of Vulgate studies. After considering these modern calls for reexamination, I will turn our attention to recent studies of the Vulgate tradition.

The following two historical attempts to trace the early transmission of the Vulgate (Berger and Chapman) follow the traditional genealogical method. This method seeks to understand the creation of iterative manuscripts through the production of a family tree. In so doing, one can work backwards or forwards, depending on intention and available evidence, to establish relationships between like manuscripts. Metzger surveys this 'classical method' in chapter six of his *Text of the New Testament*.<sup>41</sup> Such a method could be seen above in the discussion of the *Vetus Latina*; the tradition can be primarily divided between African and European/Italian endeavours. These subdivisions are the so-called 'families' of the genealogical method.

M.L. West aimed to freshen the classical approach of those such as Paul Maas in his 1973 *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*.<sup>42</sup> While West's intentions, like Maas's, were centrally concerned with classical literature, the methods and reflections are inheritors of the sort of methods undertaken by Samuel Berger and John Chapman below. Furthermore, the analysis put forth by this dissertation is largely indebted to this historical method of manuscript study. The choice to include the Codices *Vercellensis* (*a*), *Veronensis* (*b*) and Bezae (*d*) implicitly limits the scope to what has been termed the European family of manuscripts. Additionally, it seeks to provide comparative evidence of the very earliest examples.

---

<sup>39</sup> S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, (1893),

<sup>40</sup> J. Chapman, Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels, (1908).

<sup>41</sup> Metzger, (1964/2005), 205-209, esp. 207.

<sup>42</sup> As stated in his *Introduction*, M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, (1973) 5. See also, Paul Maas, *Textkritik*, (1957).

The limitations of this method are evident. E.C. Colwell challenged the traditional line by stating the obvious: that the genealogical method ‘can chart the history of transmission in an area narrowly limited in time in space’.<sup>43</sup> Metzger summarizes the arguments of Joseph Bédier, the early critic of the genealogical method, as consisting of two problems: the inutility of disparate family trees, and the subjective nature of the variable classifications.<sup>44</sup> This dissertation’s analysis has in most ways sided with the Bédier-Colwell side of textual criticism. In order to produce useful families through which useful comparison may be accomplished, conceits of fundamental facts of creation must be made. This dissertation seeks to move beyond set creation dates or locations and observe each Patristic lemma as a unique entity to be compared to further Patristic, *Vetus Latina*, and Vulgate evidence. The following two discussions on Berger and Chapman demonstrate some of the pitfalls of the genealogical method. For example, if *stemma*, linear, growth from a single source is sought, then a single point of origination must already be known or posited. Regardless, their historical methods are valuable to reproduce in the following conversation as they present a microcosmic case study of the entire 1500 years of Vulgate study.

In many ways, this dissertation has adhered to the methodological approach of ‘thoroughgoing/judicious eclecticism’ or ‘rational criticism’<sup>45</sup> defined by Metzger as an ‘almost exclusive consideration to the style of the author and the demands of the context’.<sup>46</sup> Through the dissection of Jerome’s writings laid against Vulgate recensions, I have attempted to give proper weight to variations in the context of Jerome’s life and history. That is to say that a critical perspective in light of the Vulgate’s history was

---

<sup>43</sup> E.C. Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, (1969), 66-83, as cited in Metzger, (1964/2005) 210.

<sup>44</sup> Metzger, (1964/2005), 210. J. Bédier, ‘La tradition manuscrite du Lai de l’ombre: réflexions sur l’art d’éditer les anciens textes,’ *Romania* 54 (1928) 161-96, 321-56, as cited in Metzger.

<sup>45</sup> Which Metzger claims is coined by Marie-Joseph Lagrange as seen in his title, *La critique textuelle*, 2, *La critique rationnelle* (1935).

<sup>46</sup> Metzger, (1964/2005), 223.



introduced into my analysis. A brief historiographical summary is required so that this history might be properly understood.

The first full modern effort in tracing the early Vulgate was produced by Samuel Berger. The Frenchman presented the first ambitious overview of the Vulgate's history in 1893. In the introduction to his work, he summarises the difficulty of his goal from the onset: 'The Vulgate is not precisely a book, but rather, it is a collection of partial translations, of which the order and the grouping is able to vary endlessly.'<sup>47</sup> The implicit problem rests in the imprecise nature of the Vulgate: How can we delineate a lucid history for a document which itself is difficult to define? More than 120 years later, the imprecision still presents its challenges. And while the intervening time may have 'advanced' our understanding to 'allow a tentative history of [the Vulgate's] creation'<sup>48</sup>, the understanding remains tentative due in large part to the nearly complete obfuscation of the facts of its creation.

Thus, the Frenchman had only textual criticism based on the later reproduction of this loose assembly to produce his history. Berger's work laid the foundation for research into the complex formation of the Vulgate, with heavy emphasis on Gallic influence in the transmission of the Vulgate. Likewise, Chapman would attempt to continue this line of work however noticeably in a similarly sympathetic way for his native England. Both men contributed greatly to the early understanding of the transmission of the texts from the time of their creation through the Middle Ages. In his review, T.K. Abbott succinctly summarised Berger's efforts as 'follow[ing] the geographical method, seeking to find the local origin of the different recensions'.<sup>49</sup> This work in particular helped to reset the course of scholarship from seeing the Vulgate as a

---

<sup>47</sup> S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, (1893), x. 'La Vulgate n'est pas précisément un livre, c'est plutôt un recueil de traductions partielles, dont l'ordre et le groupement peuvent varier à l'infini.'

<sup>48</sup> C. Brown Tkacz, 'Labor tam utilis' *VC* 50.1 (1996), 54.

<sup>49</sup> T.K. Abbott, 'M. Berger's History of the Vulgate,' *Hermathena* vol. 9, no. 20 (1894), 51.

monolithic work to one of some variable complexity through the centuries of its transmission.

Unfortunately, from Berger's time to the present day, little more has been accomplished in order to definitively establish the author of the original Vulgate revision. Berger states, 'History is not written as we would like to write it, but rather as we are able to understand it. Yet the history of the Vulgate in the first centuries of its existence is nearly completely hidden from us.'<sup>50</sup> Much of the early Vulgate history, lest by some unforeseen circumstance a true original document is found, must be built backwards from the later manuscripts. But we need not stop and fully generalise because the early text seems to be 'nearly completely hidden from us.' This attitude has unfortunately led to the building of a Vulgate history on weak foundations. The weakest foundation for the Vulgate Gospels is that Jerome is the original editor. This presumption is alluring given the haze surrounding the translation and collation of each of the Vulgate Gospels. The prologue to the Vulgate Gospels is a personal letter from Jerome to his patron Pope Damasus ('Jerome to Blessed Damasus')<sup>51</sup> detailing his method in editing the Latin Gospels:

'I sit as some sort of arbiter that wherever they might vary among themselves, I might sort out which of those might truly correspond with the Greek... There are nearly as many (Latin examples) as there are manuscripts. If, however, the true meaning is sought from those many, why not correct them returning to the Greek original since they are poorly edited by terrible translators...' (*Preface* 2-3, 13-15).<sup>52</sup>

Specifically, the Vulgate tradition often included this letter as a *Preface* to the works that followed (see commentary and own translation below). Furthermore, Jerome has long been associated with the Vulgate Old Testament, and his reputation as the great

---

<sup>50</sup> L'histoire ne s'écrit pas comme on voudrait l'écrire, mais comme on peut la connaître, or l'histoire de la Vulgate, dans les premiers siècles de son existence, nous est presque entièrement cachée.' Berger (1893) x, 301.

<sup>51</sup> Beato papae Damasus Hieronymus (*Preface* 1).

<sup>52</sup> See Latin and my interlinear translation p 65.

doctor translator of the Church provided very little in the way of perpetuating the idea that the Vulgate Gospels were Jerome's.

In 1908, Dom John Chapman set about creating an updated history based upon the 'riches amassed by Bishop Wordsworth and the late M. Samuel Berger,' in his *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*.<sup>53</sup> His work, like his French predecessor, focuses on the development of the Vulgate as can be ascertained through a reconstruction of manuscript history. His conclusions are laid bare from the onset and can be summarised by the very first line of his preliminary chapter: 'It is well known that the best text of the Vulgate Gospels is handed down by the MSS written in Northumbria, AΔSY, and in a few others closely connected with these.' Chapman's oeuvre as a whole is an impressive interpretation of Vulgate manuscript families through the tracing of their creations. A researcher hoping to learn more about the Vulgate manuscripts could scarcely do better than make Chapman's clear delineation of the otherwise murky history a ready handbook. He builds a fascinating story of the importance of the Northumbrian MSS, specifically the *Codex Amiatinus* (A) of Cassiodorus [ch. 2-4]. His unraveling of the bizarre history of the Vulgate Gospel harmony of the Capuan *Codex Fuldensis* (F), Victor of Capua, Eugippius, and their relationship with the Northumbrian text is invaluable [ch. 5-8]. He continues with the Vulgate in Ireland and with Patrick [ch. 9], a set of Gospels associated with Augustine found in the Bodleian in Oxford [ch. 10], the Vulgate text of St. Gregory [ch. 11], and finally a discussion on various Vulgate Gospel prologues [ch. 12-15].

Chapman's reconstruction of this history is illustrative of the very earliest dissemination of the Vulgate Gospel text. However, such a forward-looking study requires a point of origination. As may be clear by my short summary of the layout of his study, Chapman must necessarily build forward from later manuscripts. On the

---

<sup>53</sup> J. Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*, (1908).

earliest creation of the Vulgate itself, Chapman is contented to make statements such as, ‘No one is likely to contest the verdict of Bishop Wordsworth that these famous and beautiful codices (Northumbrian) have on the whole preserved a purer Hieronymian strain than has any other family.’<sup>54</sup> The relative perfection of the Northumbrian family is thus fulfilled by its perception as being the truest to the work of Jerome. Chapman gives us the standard history of the Vulgate Gospels, which bears relating here in full:

The Vulgate Gospels were published by the saint in Rome in the year 382, only a century before Eugippius. The Roman grandees to whom St. Jerome was a spiritual father, and especially that Anician family whose greatness he celebrates (Proba), will certainly have furnished themselves with copies of the first edition. Nay, to some of them, especially to the great ladies, and doubtless to his friend Proba, the author must have given presentation copies. The later Proba, to whom Eugippius dedicated his principal work and with whom St. Fulgentius corresponded, was of the same Anician gens, which furnished most of the consuls of that day. She was probably closely related (perhaps daughter or sister) to the Probinus who was consul in 489. It is likely that her great library was inherited; and if so, nothing is more natural that that she should have possessed a presentation copy of St. Jerome’s Gospels handed down from some ancestor or ancestors who had known Jerome.<sup>55</sup>

Chapman continues, ‘this is but guesswork.’<sup>56</sup> Guesswork, indeed, of Proba and probabilities, but hardly a convincing argument based upon hard evidence. Here, he tries to tie late fifth century Biblicist and publisher Eugippius to a definitively Hieronymian document. Hieronymian primacy is a helpful starting point from which to build such an ambitious history as Chapman’s, and upon this foundation the *status quo* has been built. While Berger and Chapman present foundational lucid reports on the earliest transmission of identifiably Vulgate manuscripts, they accept the largely unverified account as related above by Chapman.

---

<sup>54</sup> Chapman, (1908), 42

<sup>55</sup> Chapman, (1908), 42-3.

<sup>56</sup> op. cit. 43.

The further into the later history of the Vulgate one delves, the more there are readily understood facts. After the documents had branched, reassembled, and branched again, intrepid students at the University of Paris in the 13<sup>th</sup> century set forth on a task to reclaim the original text of Jerome. Weber and Gryson's preface to the fifth edition states, 'They (the Parisian students) judged that the commentary lemma ought *a priori* to harbour ... a preferable text because it represented the last word of Jerome on the question.'<sup>57</sup> This attempt at a purer text of 'Jerome's Vulgate' would eventually be adopted as the primary text in the creation of the first official text, the Clementine Vulgate of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>58</sup> Weber and Gryson thought astutely to give lower prominence to the Parisian texts and Clementine Vulgate. This is not to say that these texts were not important. In fact, both efforts as singular examples of study Bibles have perhaps more impact than any other individual manuscript. However, the Stuttgart edition includes a tacit admission: that which is more originally Vulgate is not necessarily that which is originally Jerome.

The Vulgate's contemporary reception has seen a diminished role in the Catholic Church. The Second Vatican Council reassessed the Vulgate tradition in light of its goals to reestablish vernacular worship. Not surprisingly, the old guard of Latin Scripture and ritual would see its role reduced. The *Dogmatic Constitution of Divine Revelation*, or the *Dei Verbum*, proclaimed the following on the status of the Vulgate in the Church:

Easy access to Sacred Scripture should be provided for all the Christian faithful. That is why the Church from the very beginning accepted as her own that very ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament which is called the septuagint; and she has always given a place of honor to other Eastern translations and Latin ones especially the Latin translation known as the vulgate. But since the word of God should be accessible at all times, the Church by her authority and with maternal concern sees to it that suitable and

---

<sup>57</sup> Weber and Gryson, XXXVIII, XLI.

<sup>58</sup> op. cit. idem.

correct translations are made into different languages, especially from the original texts of the sacred books. And should the opportunity arise and the Church authorities approve, if these translations are produced in cooperation with the separated brethren as well, all Christians will be able to use them.<sup>59</sup>

This statement set a clear tone away from seven hundred years of Vulgate supremacy to one of consolation for vernacular translations. The young Biblicist Joseph Ratzinger (later Benedict XVI) sought to unravel this challenging new declaration four years later in his 'Sacred Scripture in the Life of the Church'. Ratzinger writes that the choice to consider the Vulgate as only a sort of *primus inter pares* is a 'restatement of the relation between Scripture and Tradition', as the statement of the Vulgate's superiority 'alone as authentic would be to place tradition above Scripture.'<sup>60</sup> Ratzinger further comments:

The call to open wide the gates of Scripture to all believers acquires its particular emphasis when seen against the background of its history. The barriers that had been erected from the 13th, and especially the 15th, century against the Bible in the vernacular and the reading of it by those who were not theologians, are here firmly removed. Our text represents the final and definitive overcoming of the restrictions set up in various forms of the index of Paul IV, and from Pius IV, Sixtus V, Clement VIII down to Gregory XVI, and proves itself here to be a revision of the Tridentine decisions: the *inhaerens vestigiis* again proves to be an advance. If at that time the fight against the Reformation had led to a sequestration of Scripture, now the concern for dialogue led to a return to it in the most intensive way.<sup>61</sup>

It is likely unnecessary to remind the reader that this young scholar would become Pope Benedict XVI, a man not popularly known for such 'progressive' theories on Church

---

<sup>59</sup> *Dei Verbum*, as promulgated by Pope Paul VI, (18 November, 1965), ch. 6.22. Official Vatican English translation taken from: [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19651118\\_dei-verbum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html). Original Latin may be found at [~dei-verbum\\_lt.html](#). Accessed: 1 April 2015.

<sup>60</sup> Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI), 'Sacred Scripture in the Life of the Church,' ch. 6, *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, 3, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler, (1968), 264-5. See also Joseph A. Komonchuk 'The Council of Trent at the Second Vatican Council,' ch. 4, *From Trent to Vatican II: Historical and Theological Investigations*, eds. Raymond F. Bulman, Frederick J. Parrella (2006), 61-80.

<sup>61</sup> Ratzinger (1969), 264.

History. A man who almost celebrates that 'here Trent is indeed left far behind'<sup>62</sup>, would just over forty years later resign from the Pontificate in Latin. Perhaps this speaks to the lasting impact of the Vulgate and the Roman Church's Latin past. Some have since lamented the dimming star of Latinity in the Church. Gerard Sloyan traces the nearly two millennia of Latin's prominence up to this shift in the late Sixties.<sup>63</sup> Latent consternation of such a change is understandable. The Roman Church had developed a long history based on its *Romanitas* and *Latinitas*. How then could such an institution shake its linguistic history? Should it?

The legacy of those revered men who toiled to create the pinnacles of Catholic Latin achievement were now in question. If the Vulgate was considered to be 'the most profound and lasting influence which Jerome has had on the history of Christianity'<sup>64</sup>, what role was there now for Jerome? Such hypotheticals are mere conjecture. The Vulgate has experienced continued interest throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and into the 21<sup>st</sup>. Jerome's role is certainly more nuanced than Brown's quotation above gives proper credit. He was an utterly complex man<sup>65</sup> whose imprint on Medieval and Renaissance culture and scholarship is immeasurable.<sup>66</sup> As will be further discussed below, his life was one of enormous scholarly production. And while his work was at times of variable quality, his brilliant strokes stand as critical works in Western humane culture.

However, the role of Jerome and the Vulgate has in the last fifty years been called into question. This dissertation has attempted in some small way to answer that question. This study attempts to elucidate the obscure history of the Vulgate's creation.

---

<sup>62</sup> op. cit. 265.

<sup>63</sup> Gerard S. Sloyan, 'The Latin of the Roman Rite: Before Trent and After Vatican II', *From Trent to Vatican II: Historical and Theological Investigations*, (2006), 103-116, is a recent scholarly lament of such depreciation of Latin.

<sup>64</sup> Brown, (1992), 87.

<sup>65</sup> 'Far cleverer and more versatile than Rufinus, more learned and acute than Augustine, he lacked the balance and solidity of the one, the nobility and generosity of the other', Kelly, (1998), 335.

<sup>66</sup> See Eugene F. Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance*, (1985).

The best method to understand the Vulgate is to understand its legendary creator, Jerome of Stridon. As such, this study will dissect critical documents in the corpus of Jerome's prolific work and set about determining Jerome's text of the Gospels.

In 1907 Pope Pius X commissioned the Benedictine order with the first full Catholic revision of the Vulgate since Pope Clement VIII and the Council of Trent. While the effort would not be the success both Rome and its Benedictine International College of St Anselm had hoped, it marked a revival of academic interest in the Latin Vulgate. The effort produced a remarkable pamphlet of only sixteen pages entitled *The Revision of the Vulgate: A Report* in which the Benedictines petitioned their audience for financial support in their Vatican sponsored endeavour. This short pamphlet is notable for its concise summary of popular belief regarding the Vulgate tradition:

[Our goal] is to determine the text of St. Jerome's Latin translation, made in the fourth century. The task undertaken by the learned doctor of the Church in the last quarter of that century, was the production of an accurate text of the Latin Bible to take the place of the numerous versions then current. At the present day scholars are practically agreed as to the competence of St. Jerome for the work given him by Pope St. Damasus. He, moreover, had access to Greek and other manuscripts, even then considered ancient, which are no longer known to us; he could compare dozens of texts for every one we now examine and he had means of testing the value of his authorities, which we do not now possess. It is obvious, therefore, that the possession of the pure text of St. Jerome's version is greatly to be desired, and it would unquestionably furnish the basis of any critical edition of the present authentic Latin Bible. No doubt our present text substantially represents that which St. Jerome produced in the fourth century, but no less certainly is it clear that it stands in need of close examination and much correction. It is consequently the aim of the present Commission to determine with all possible exactness the Latin text of St. Jerome, and not to produce any new version. How far St. Jerome was correct in his translation is altogether another matter, and to determine this will no doubt be the work of some future Commission.<sup>67</sup>

Certainly, much needed to be done to further examine and critically compile a Vulgate for the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, an opus by and large completed by the Stuttgart edition of Weber

---

<sup>67</sup> The Revision of the Vulgate: A Report, (1909). 1



and Gryson. But the Benedictines recognised the further dilemma: to what extent does any collation of the Vulgate contain a translation of reasonable Latinity? A tangential concern would arise for such a putative future commission: to what extent is the Vulgate even Jerome's? The Benedictines, and of course Pope Pius X, surely were convinced of its Hieronymian origin. Such a preconception was far and away the norm in Vulgate studies – as they are.

Why then has a critical assessment of the Vulgate been so slow in the making? The Benedictines give a colourful commentary of the considerable effort needed to produce a new edition in an age 'which is preëminently an age of critical examination':<sup>68</sup>

For the purpose of the collation it was determined to print a copy of the present Clementine text of the Latin Scriptures; each page, to the extent of two thirds of its surface, being left blank; with no capital letters, no stops, no word divided and in every way made as much like a manuscript as possible. With this text, so prepared, the reviser, on comparing it with a manuscript he desires to collate, by the simple device of correcting the print like an ordinary proof sheet, is able to reproduce every important feature of the manuscript.<sup>69</sup>

They continue:

The printing of this Bible, which is to form the basis of the collations, has taken almost twelve months; and the preparation of the text and the correction of the proof sheets alone has been no light task. The production has also been necessarily a very costly matter. One hundred copies have been printed upon the best hand made paper; 200 upon ordinary book paper and 60 upon thin paper, and the Commission would have hesitated to incur the expense had not the Pope decided that this was the best system to secure thoroughness. He himself too has now advanced the money to pay for the printing.<sup>70</sup>

The project had at least fifteen members, who while working 'gratuitously' nonetheless estimated a financial burden over eight to ten years of £10,000 – about £1,000,000 in

---

<sup>68</sup> *ibid.* 4.

<sup>69</sup> *ibid.* p. 7

<sup>70</sup> *Report*, (1909), 10-11.

2014.<sup>71</sup> Such a project was unquestionably Herculean. It would require tremendous amounts of analogue replication and was bound by all sorts of human errors attendant since the days of medieval *scriptoria*. Furthermore, the blessing of His Holiness was evidently a prerequisite in the commencement of such a work for any serious Catholic. Given that any interest in the Vulgate exclusively rested in the minds of serious Catholics, without such a blessing little scholarship was accomplished.

My study is admittedly less ambitious. I have trusted the mostly satisfactory Stuttgart edition to provide a critical edition where the Benedictines came up short. However, where the holy men in Rome at the turn of the twentieth century relied on reams of paper – some apparently of the ‘best hand made’ variety – we are spoiled by our age of technological advancement. I have been able to traverse the Channel in a matter of hours and access the treasures of both the British Library and la Bibliothèque nationale de France. When I have been unable to find a critical book, digital repositories such as Archive.org, Google Books, or Gallica have scans at the ready. If a question for a colleague should arise, I have been able to send and receive an e-mail in a matter of minutes. Most importantly for my work, I have been able to use indexes like Biblindex.fr to seek out Patristic citations and then collate *Vetus Latina*, Vulgate, Jerome, and further Patristic evidence into tables in Word. Statistical occurrences of particular translations were quickly calculated and permuted through the use of Excel spreadsheets. If I required some trickery of format such as the Benedictines laboured with much treasure and talent, I only had to hit a few simple formatting buttons to achieve in minutes what took them a year.

This is all to perhaps shed some light onto why such claims as found in this thesis may seem relatively novel. My work naturally relies on all of those before me who have studied the Vulgate so intensely. I should think that if they had the tools of

---

<sup>71</sup> *ibid.* 13, 15.

our modern era, they might have recognised many of the same sort of inconsistencies I present in this thesis. It is an exciting time for Patristics and textual criticism as old impossibilities become possible. In fact, a recent volume (LIV) of *Studia Patristica* was in large part dedicated to the exciting new Biblindex platform and new methods in Patristic citation cross-referencing. The editors of this volume, Laurence Mellerin and Hugh Houghton, introduced the volume by stating:

The adoption of digital media and the ensuing possibility for the interoperability of tools and the re-use of data means that we should make the most of opportunities for collaboration, in order to ensure the broadest possible coverage and create resources which will endure for future generations.<sup>72</sup>

In many ways, my thesis's title, *Jerome's Text of the Gospels*, would until recently never be considered worthy of further examination – after all, his text was Vulgate, one might respond in echoing preconceptions of history. The inquiry that modern technology has allowed into ancient texts has opened up a new frontier of textual criticism and critical scholarship. The remainder of this thesis hopes to live up to these new possibilities. As such, it records numerous examples taken almost exclusively from analogue sources, but presents them as digital evidence in a more digestible method than previously available.

---

<sup>72</sup> Laurence Mellerin and Hugh A.G. Houghton, 'Introduction', *Studia Patristica* vol. LIV eds. Mellerin, Houghton, and Markus Vinzent (2013) 6.

## Chapter 2

### Latinization, Damasus, and Jerome

#### Damasus

The history of the Vulgate ought to start with the story of Damasus, Jerome's patron Pope. The pope and saint who would later be remembered for remarkable feats of ecclesiastical modernization, cult reform, and consolidation of Roman power came to his throne in a tumultuous period of violence. Damasus rose to the Papal Diaconate under Pope Liberius (352-366) and his Antipope Felix (355-365).<sup>1</sup> The Liberius-Felix conflict centered on factional disagreements over the possession of Roman religious sites between partisans of the legitimate Bishop of Rome Liberius and those of the pretender.<sup>2</sup> The conflict escalated until 355 when Liberius refused to condemn Athanasius, sending the Pope to rule his throne from his exile in Thrace and leave a vacuum to be filled by his rival Felix.<sup>3</sup> Christian Rome had begun to fragment only 18 years after the death of Constantine. Just as society began to Christianize Roman power, so too did Christianity transform under the influence of this power.<sup>4</sup>

Liberius returned three years later to a Roman Church increasingly acquainted to partisanship. Liberius named the deacon Damasus as his preferred successor. Although Felix had been finally displaced, the wounds of the Liberius-Felix conflict were still fresh. Another of the seven papal deacons, Ursinus, gathered three other deacons and

---

<sup>1</sup> John Curran, *Pagan City and Christian Capital. Rome in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 2000), 138.

<sup>2</sup> *op. cit.* 130.

<sup>3</sup> *op. cit.* 131; François Monfrin, 'Damase I<sup>er</sup>' *Dictionnaire Historique de la Papauté*, ed. Philippe Levillain, (Paris, 1994), 535-9, 536.

<sup>4</sup> Paraphrased from Jean-Pierre Moisset, *Histoire du catholicisme* (Paris, 2006), 87: 'Si certaines valeurs évangéliques commencent à agir sur la société romaine du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle, en sens inverse, s'altère au contract du pouvoir.'

rose against Liberius's choice.<sup>5</sup> Lines were drawn, factions were created, and battles were waged. The fighting began on a small scale, but eventually enveloped Rome in eight years of open conflict for the succession of the Roman See.

The *pars Damasi*, Party of Damasus, was formed of the wealthy Roman elite who evidently thought of their leader as 'pliable and therefore desirable.'<sup>6</sup> The cracks of class division began to show in church politics. Battles were waged across Rome. Damasus and Ursinus mobilized all the support they could muster and marched on the Lateran Church, which is today the official church of the Bishop of Rome. Eventually, Damasus overwhelmed his opponents and occupied the Lateran.<sup>7</sup> The troops of Ursinus collected themselves and rallied from across the Tiber. 366 saw a bloody end to the conflict when, from his Lateran headquarters, Damasus sent his troops to assault the *basilica Iulii* (1 October) and then the *basilica Liberii/Sicinini*, where the 'partisans of Damasus ... slaughtered the *fideles* of Ursinus.'<sup>8</sup> Curran notes that 'the dispute between Damasus and Ursinus had led to the most serious outbreak of Christian violence since the persecutions. The legacy of Liberius included the readiness to use violent means to possess Christian sites.'<sup>9</sup> Unlike the persecutions, Christians had turned on each other in a brutally aggressive way.

Ammianus Marcellinus recorded a vivid contemporaneous account in his *Res Gestae*. He writes:

Damasus and Ursinus, both eager to snatch the episcopal seat through inordinate measures, battled most bitterly on account of their divisive zeal. And the division between both camps led to injury and death... And in this contest, Damasus prevailed through the zealous party which supported him. It is understood that in the *basilica Sicinini*, where the Christian rite convenes, in one day 137 bodies of the slaughtered

---

<sup>5</sup> Curran (2000), 138.

<sup>6</sup> Lellia Cracco Ruggini, 'Rome in Late Antiquity,' *Classical Philology*, vol 98 no 4, (Oct 2004) 366-382, 373.

<sup>7</sup> Curran (2000), 139.

<sup>8</sup> L.C. Ruggini (2004) 373-4.

<sup>9</sup> Curran (2000) 142.

were found, and only after a while with difficulty was the ravenous crowd mollified. (XXVII.3.12-3).<sup>10</sup>

The scene must have been extraordinary, with warring city gangs raising funds and troops to occupy Christian places of worship. Indubitably, it left a lasting impression on the faithful and pagan alike that this nascent Church was readily prone to violent divisiveness. But for all the violence Damasus engaged in to attain his position, he ruled from a considerably more tolerant perspective. The papacy of Damasus would after this point lead to the consolidated power of the Roman Bishop through his ‘rich pontifical legacy,’ by which he ‘was arguably the most resourceful [pope of the fourth century].’<sup>11</sup> Such a legacy would forever shape the majesty of the Roman See. Kelly notes that Damasus ‘was the first to give a quasi-royal magnificence to the hitherto modest papal household in the Lateran palace.’<sup>12</sup> Curran notes ‘Damasus’s appetite for the episcopal chair was followed, however, by a strong sense of the need for Christian unity.’<sup>13</sup> It was perhaps in an attempt to finally repair the internal strife that Damasus launched a number of plans for Christian unity.

Damasus set out immediately and pursued a broad program of ‘liturgical reforms and architectural ventures, an increasing centralization of papal power based on the notion of Petrine primacy, and promotion of the cult of martyrs through his poems in Vergilian hexameters.’<sup>14</sup> It is likely from the court of Damasus in the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum* that the first explicit reference to *Matthew* 16:18 (*Tu es*

---

<sup>10</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus *Res Gestae* (XXVII.3.12-3): ‘12) Damasus et Ursinus supra humanum modum ad rapiendam episcopalem sedem arduos, scissis studiis asperime conflictabantur ad usque mortis uulnerumque discrimina adiumentis utriusque progressis.... 13) et in concertatione superauerat Damasus, parte, quae ei fauebat, instante. Constatque in basilica Sicinini, ubi ritus Christiani est conuenticulum, uno die centum triginta septem reperta cadauera peremptorum, efferatamque diu plebem aegre postea delenitam’..

<sup>11</sup> Andrew Cain, *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009) 43.

<sup>12</sup> J.N.D. Kelly *Jerome* (1975) 82.

<sup>13</sup> Curran (2000) 142.

<sup>14</sup> Cain (2009) 44.

*Petrus...*) is used to support Roman/Petrine Primacy.<sup>15</sup> Of course, such a push for opulence and reconsolidation of power is contextualized by the method through which Damasus ascended to the Petrine throne. The contested Pope sought to legitimize his rule to his city and church, fully cognizant of the lingering opposition he would face. In his attempt to grasp upon a flailing sense of *Romanitas* in the shadow of Constantinople, Damasus set forth an ambitious propagation of Latin in the liturgy. Maura Lafferty summarizes the program: 'For Damasus, the adoption of a Latin liturgy allowed him to identify the Roman church more closely with traditional Roman culture, to appropriate the values and prestige of that culture for Christians, and to claim a share in the aristocratic life of the city for the rulers of the Roman church.'<sup>16</sup>

We should pause here to consider the reasons Damasus might force ecclesiastical linguistic progressivism. The story of the Church's Latinization is expertly told and meticulously researched by Lafferty in her *Translating Faith*, and what follows in this paragraph is a summary of her work. She frames the push for Latin superiority in view of Diocletian's encouragement of *Romanitas* as intrinsic with *Latinitas*; in effect, Diocletian viewed the connection with the Italian language in his elite law schools and imperial centers of his far-flung empire as a connection to the traditional days of Roman superiority (26-7). This sort of connection to the past was advanced by Constantine, who despite the relocation of his capital to the Greek East, offered diplomatic messages and speeches in Latin (27). Lafferty cites Augustine's lament in *de Civitate Dei* 19.7 that conquered men without mutual language lack any means of connection and 'that a man would be more cheerful with his dog than with a foreigner' (25). In citing Walter

---

<sup>15</sup> As remarked by Monfrin (1994) 539, who calls the *Decretum Gelasianum* the *Decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*. 'Quamuis uniuersae per orbem catholicae diffusae ecclesiae unus thalamus Christi sit, sancta tamen Romana ecclesia nullis synodicis constitutis ceteris ecclesiis praelata est, sed evangelica uoce domini et saluatoris nostri primatum obtenuit: 'tu es Petrus' inquit 'et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam...' (Dec. Gel. III.1)

<sup>16</sup> Maura Lafferty, 'Translating Faith from Greek to Latin: Romanitas and Christianitas in Late Fourth-century Rome and Milan', *J ECS* 11 (2003), 21-62, 62. The article is indispensable for contextualizing Damasus' liturgical Latinization.

Berschin,<sup>17</sup> Lafferty notes that translation into Latin was seen as a ‘patriotic duty’ and a further Roman-Latin subjugation of something foreign (26). The displacement of Greek was gradual and ‘was far from inevitable’ (28). Greek, the language of the Church since its inception, remained throughout the third century, even showing on epitaphs of the graves of Latin-named popes (29). On liturgical language, Lafferty states: ‘while the language of most Christians in Rome shifted from Greek to Latin in the third century, all of our sources for the eucharistic prayers in Rome up until 360 quote them in Greek’ (29). In Christian Africa, the Latinization occurred earlier, as will be mentioned in our discussion of the *Vetus Latina* traditions. It was during this Latin revival that Damasus had taken the helm of the Roman bishopric. Lafferty notes that ‘polytheistic elite’ perception of ‘true learning’ included a serious study of Latin classical works (37). In order to confront these opponents and to inject Christianity into the milieu of high culture, Damasus had to push for his Church to accede to higher level of *Romanitas*. ‘Damasus behaved more like an aristocrat than like any of the former bishops of Rome’ (40); and in acting the part he sought to ingratiate his church with the same sort of elites who had backed his bid for the See.

Thus, an aristocratic Roman bishop, having fought violently to accede to his claim to the Petrine throne, sought to further emphasize his legitimacy by following the current of Latinization in his Roman church. His efforts caught the eye of a Dalmatian cleric on an extended retreat in the Christian East. Jerome writes his first, and seemingly unsolicited, letter to the Pope (*Ep.* 15) ostensibly asking for theological guidance in a succession crisis in the See of Antioch, and the Pope’s opinion on the *hypostases*.<sup>18</sup> Leaving the given reasons for the letter aside, Jerome’s introduction to the Pope is

---

<sup>17</sup> Walter Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages from Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*, rev. ed., tr. Jerold C Frakes (Washington, 1988), 48.

<sup>18</sup> Megan Hale Williams, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago, 2006), 274-5.



sycophantic, belying the interpreter's ambitions. The ascetic scholar Jerome of Stridon, perhaps struck by an overwhelming sense of loneliness in his self-imposed Syrian desert exile, sent a number of missives to friends and family back in the Latin West.<sup>19</sup> It was during this period near Antioch in the late 370's that Jerome wrote to Damasus for the first time, demonstrating himself as a 'young man of great ambition as well as substantial literary gifts.'<sup>20</sup> Nonetheless, Jerome's efforts for papal recognition fell flat, and he promptly wrote another (*Ep.* 16) seeking for Damasus's attention. Again, his efforts were fruitless.<sup>21</sup> Certainly, Jerome had hoped to associate himself with the primate of his beloved West but his language also indicates a certain awe of the Roman bishop; he writes:

1) Seeing that the East beats itself up through the age-old passion of its peoples ... because of this, I think it best for me to seek counsel from the chair of Peter and the faith (Roman Church) which was esteemed by the mouth of the Apostle (Paul). From there I seek sustenance for my soul, from whence I once received the vestments of Christ ... 2) Yet while your greatness may terrify me, your humanity attracts me ... I speak with the successor to the Fisherman, the disciple of the Cross. I follow no man but Christ, thus I commune with none before you, your Blessedness, that is, the Petrine Chair. I know that upon this Rock/Peter, this Church is built.<sup>22</sup>

Jerome's letter is more than simple flattery, it is an attempt to swear fealty. As Williams states: 'Jerome metaphorically casts himself at Damasus's feet'.<sup>23</sup> Having followed the events in Rome and the ascendancy of the reforming Pope, Jerome had sought to advertise his credentials to the 'Chair of Peter.' Jerome's attack on the East as savage

<sup>19</sup> *op. cit.* 31

<sup>20</sup> *op. cit.* 29; here, Williams also hints at a tenuous pre-existing connection between Jerome and Damasus in a footnote (11) by noting Jerome's desert patron Evagrius had associated with a younger Damasus in Illyricum in 363.

<sup>21</sup> Kelly (1975), 53-4; Cain (2009), 44 & fn. 7 suggests that Damasus later acknowledged the ignored letters in a later letter to Jerome (numbered *Ep.* 35 in Jerome's work) when the two worked together in Rome. He astutely notes that here Damasus uses *legi* and not *relegi* to refer to the old letters.

<sup>22</sup> 1) Quoniam uestuto Oriens inter se populorum furore collisus go nullum primum nisi Christum sequens, Beatitudini tuae, id est, cathedrae PetriInde nunc meae animae postulans cibum unde olim Christi uestimenta suscepi ni2) Quanquam igitur tui me terreat magnitudo inuitat tamen humanitas ...) Quanquam igitur tui me terreat magnitudo inuitat tamEgo nullum primum nisi Christum sequens, Beatitudini tuae, id est, cathedrae Petri communione consocior. (*Ep.* 15.1-2)

<sup>23</sup> Williams (2006), 40.

and unrefined must have been purposefully targeted for a Pope focused on reemphasizing the *Romanitas* of the Church. After all, a letter to the Pope in Latin, let alone from the East, was obviously intended to make a statement.

The Stridonian was no stranger to producing missives as a form of thinly veiled self-promotion. Jerome first exhibits this tendency in his earliest extant writing, *Ep.* 1, written in the late 360's to early 370's.<sup>24</sup> It was explicitly addressed to Innocentius, but implicitly to Evagrius who takes center stage as the hero of its internal tale of a female martyr.<sup>25</sup> Jerome's attempt to 'burnish the glory [of his] new patron Evagrius' by lavishing extraordinary praise indirectly by addressing another in his cohort was certainly a 'clever ploy... to create and affirm a set of relationships.'<sup>26</sup> While written to a peer, Jerome set about heroizing his patron by injecting him as the main saviour/protagonist of the story. Thus, in addressing his overt flattery to Innocentius, Jerome cleverly circumnavigates the maladroit possibility of dedicating such an ingratiating work to the man with whom he seeks to be ingratiated. In Jerome's attempts to garner favour from the Roman court, however, his platitudes are explicitly directed. Here (*Ep.* 15), Jerome speaks in poetic terms of subjugation to Damasus: 'while your greatness may terrify me, your humanity attracts me.' Jerome's facility with letters to publicize his abilities or defend himself against detractors would continue throughout his career.<sup>27</sup>

As Damasus initiated his series of Latin reforms in his Western Church, his Eastern charges held a series of synods in the Empire's new capital, Constantinople.

---

<sup>24</sup> Georg Gr (2006), 40 *Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie*, (Leipzig, 1901-1908), 53.

<sup>25</sup> Kelly (1975), 39-40.

<sup>26</sup> *op. cit.* 33.

<sup>27</sup> *Ep.* 22, indubitably his most famous letter, provides a clear example of self-serving prose. In it, Jerome disavows his classical education by citing an admonition from Christ in a dream. However, such a disavowal is now seen as a hollow promise meant solely as a clever temporary apology by Harald Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics*, (Göteborg, 1958), 323-328, Johannes Geffcken, 'Antike Kulturkämpfe' *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 29, (Leipzig, 1912), 606, and most recently by Neil Adkin, *Jerome on Virginity: A Commentary on the Libellus de virginitate servanda* (Letter 22), (Oxford, 2003), 275.

Jerome stayed on in Constantinople with his mentor, Gregory Nazianzus. When Gregory left before the Council's conclusion on 9 July 381, he was without a guide until he met the contested Patriarch Paulinus of Antioch.<sup>28</sup> Paulinus was called to Rome by Damasus (and Ambrose) who were displeased with his disputed position in Antioch, and Jerome returned to Rome in the Antiochean entourage.<sup>29</sup> Jerome finally attracted the Pope's attention, as Damasus was impressed by his adept abilities in translation.

### Jerome

Jerome was born during a period of growing Latin intellectual prominence in the Church during the mid-340's CE,<sup>30</sup> only a few years after the death of Constantine and the advent of Christendom.<sup>31</sup> We know his birth place only as Stridon, an otherwise unknown town in the proximity of Aquileia in northeast Italy.<sup>32</sup> Except for a two year reign (361-362) of Julian, called the Apostate, Christianity flourished both popularly and politically throughout Jerome's life. His father had arranged for his education in Rome, where he exclusively studied Latin literary greats – primarily Virgil and Cicero as well as Sallust, Terence, Seneca, Plautus, Horace, and Quintilian.<sup>33</sup>

Although Jerome was born to a Christian family, his religious zeal and asceticism would not develop until the latter part of his education in Rome. He began to explore his religion and develop his devotion with fellow pupils during his education in the capital city; he writes that he would join his fellow students to gather for religious

---

<sup>28</sup> Kelly (1975), 80.

<sup>29</sup> Williams (2006), 50; Kelly (1975), 80; Cain (2009), 44-5.

<sup>30</sup> F. Cavellera, *Saint Jérôme: Sa vie et son œuvre* 2eme partie, (Louvain, 1922), 3-4, *pace* Kelly, (1975), 337-339 who dedicates an appendix to his birthdate. However, as per Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible*, (Oxford, 1993) 5 Kelly's rather early dating of around 331 would have made Jerome far too old at points we expect a younger man. See also E.F. Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance*, (Baltimore, 1988) 1-4 on how when Jerome describes himself as *adulescens* in the 350-360's, a birth of the early to mid-340's is necessary.

<sup>31</sup> For an overview on the impact of Constantine on nascent Christendom see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *A History of Christianity*, (London, 2009), 189-228; Paul Veyne, *Quand notre monde est devenu chrétien*, (Paris, 2007) is a short but important book in full on the birth of Christendom.

<sup>32</sup> Kelly (1975) 1 & 337-9.

<sup>33</sup> See Rice (1988), 3-7; Kelly (1975), 10-17; Pierre Courcelle, *Les Lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (Paris, 1943) 58-89; Hagendahl (1958), 101-106 on Jerome's focus on Quintilian.

meetings and would participate in journeys such as visits to the catacombs of martyrs.<sup>34</sup> Jerome was finally baptised during the latter days of his education, sometime before 363.<sup>35</sup> While his religion became an increasingly important aspect of his life, he remained, for the time being, an ambitious young rhetorician who did not yet witness conflict between Cicero and Christianity. His first job was working in the imperial government of the new administrative capital of the Empire in Trier where he accumulated a library of the authors that were the foundations of his education.<sup>36</sup> Jerome's movements over the next two decades were constantly itinerant as he moved from Trier to Antioch and its surrounding deserts, to Rome and his sad final departure from the urban centre he loved in August 385, and then his last three years' journey through the East until his final and permanent monastic settlement in the environs of Bethlehem.<sup>37</sup> While the finality to Jerome's wanderings was a point of personal difficulty, it provided him with the opportunity to occupy himself solely in his studies in this later half of his life from 388 to his death in 420. This period was his most productive, during which Jerome produced his Old Testament Commentaries, the bulk of his *Epistles*, his various *Lives*, and his propagandist history *De viris illustribus* (*DVI*).

---

<sup>34</sup> *Commentariorum in Ezechielem* 12:40.5-13.

<sup>35</sup> *Epistle* 15.1. Cavallera, (1922) 3-12. Cavallera presents the years 359-363 as the most likely dates for his rhetorical training. The fact this took place during his education in Rome during the mid-350's, is further evidence for a birthdate in the early 340's. See also Kelly (1975), 22-3.

<sup>36</sup> Rice (1988), 2; Kelly (1975), 28. Jerome's library would grow to famous proportions throughout his career.

<sup>37</sup> Kelly (1975), 114-128 on this unhappy fall from grace of the Roman elite and his foundation in Bethlehem.

## Chapter 3

### The Roman Works

When Jerome was ensconced in the life of the Roman Church, he began the production of a number of ambitious and influential works. The following is an assessment of three of these Roman era works: *Epistle 22* to Eustochium on ascetic virginity, *Against Helvidius: On the Perpetual Virginity of Mary*, and his *Letter to Damasus: Introduction to the Four Gospels*. A theme may be quickly gleaned from the basic description of the first two: virginity. Indeed, this period marked Jerome's introductory foray into the promotion of Eastern Asceticism to a Western audience. The last two together mark contemporaneous efforts to the supposed production of the Hieronymian Gospel translations. In looking at these three documents, we are given the opportunity to seize upon Jerome's text of the Gospels before and during his supposed editorial period.

The ascetic works, *Ep. 22* and *Against Helvidius*, mark Jerome's entry into his promotion of virginity. Asceticism would become one of Jerome's most recognizable features. In his introduction to his work on Jerome's letters, Andrew Cain recounts a tale in which Pope Sixtus walks by a painting of a disheveled and gaunt Jerome self-flagellating with a rock. 'You do well to carry that stone,' says Sixtus, 'for without it the Church would never have canonised you.' It is in *Ep. 22* that this zeal is most famously carried out.

*Epistle 22*

The letter is Jerome's most famous and studied letter. Addressed to Eustochium, it is often called the *Libellus de Virginitate Servanda* for its primary theme of ascetic promotion of virginity. Written during his final moments in Rome, likely by early 384, the letter is demonstrative of the profound influence of the scholar's exegetical and secretarial work for Pope Damasus on his scholarly career going forward.<sup>2</sup> The letter's popular fame, however, comes not from its promotion of virginity to the young Eustochium, but rather its dramatic portrayal of Jerome's renunciation of his secular letters for a life of scriptural reflection. This renunciation is told in the form of a dream in which a heavenly Judge tells a bedridden Jerome that he is guilty of being a Ciceronian, not a Christian.

Before relating the dream in section 30, the letter takes a hard line against the reading of secular works and admonishes that a Christian virgin should avoid eloquent works of non-Christian rhetoric or philosophy.<sup>3</sup> Jerome then attacks the very authors he had previously held in esteem: 'What would Horace do with a psalter, Virgil with the gospels, or Cicero with the Apostle?'<sup>4</sup> Anticipating the dramatic scene to come, Jerome defames the pagan authors he was widely criticised for knowing by demonstrating that their literature, despite its erudition, could never be properly profound as it never dealt with Scripture.

The dream-vow takes place in front of not only the Judge but the assumed audience at-large and seemingly indicates that his renowned reliance on classicism, and Cicero specifically, had come to a close. In the throes of a terrible illness, Jerome

---

<sup>2</sup> Kelly (London, 1975) 100-1; Hagendahl (Göteborg, 1953) 319.

<sup>3</sup> Adkin (Oxford, 2003) 275; Hagendahl (Göteborg, 1953) 109-10 and *Ep.* 22.29.6.

<sup>4</sup> *Quid facit cum psalterio Horatius? Cum evangeliiis Maro? Cum apostolo Cicero?* (*Ep.* 22:29.7).

dreams that he is brought to a trial with the Judge to whom he vows: 'Lord, if I should ever possess worldly books, if I should ever even read them, I deny you.'<sup>5</sup>

The surrounding history helps to contextualise this scene. Jerome was under increasing pressure from his critics for his choices of literary references and allusions, especially from his once closest ally and now fiercest critic, Rufinus.<sup>6</sup> This is succinctly addressed in *Ep.* 22:30 as he sets up his dream as occurring during a sickness which he describes as 'I, wretched, would fast so as to read Cicero; after many nights in vigil, after many tears, which flowed from the depth of my breast on recollection of my past sins, I would take up Plautus into my hands.'<sup>7</sup> A few lines later and we hear about his famous inquisition by the Judge regarding his 'Ciceronianism'. The line sets the scene of a miserably sick man and is evidence for the physical cause of his dream. By weaving illness with study of the secular, the pathogen becomes equated with these works he 'picked up in hand'. He returned to the prophets whenever he felt better, but he confesses that he 'hated the rough language'<sup>8</sup>, of the religious writers and returned to pagan works. He reports: 'with my blind eyes I could not see the light!'<sup>9</sup> He ties his deteriorating health with his insistence on reading the pagan works from his past. And 'meanwhile the funeral was being prepared,'<sup>10</sup> the dream comes to Jerome.

Jerome's *Ep.* 21 – written about a year before his *Ep.* 22 in Rome to Pope Damasus circa 383) – echoes this sentiment of negativity toward his pagan influences. In his comments on the state of the Church he not only declaims those Christian mouths which swear 'by omnipotent Jupiter, Hercules, and Crastor'<sup>11</sup>, but those supposed

<sup>5</sup> Domine, si umquam habuero codices saeculares, si legero, te negavi (*Ep.* 22:33).

<sup>6</sup> On Jerome and Rufinus see Mark Vessey, 'Jerome and Rufinus' ch 28 in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, (2004), and on the relationship re: *Ep.* 22, especially 324-5.

<sup>7</sup> Miser ego lecturus Tullium ieiunabam; post noctium crebras vigilias, post lacrimas, quas mihi praeteritorum recordatio peccatorum ex imis visceribus eruebat, Plautus sumebatur in manibus. (*Ep.* 22:30).

<sup>8</sup> sermo horrebat incultus (*Ep.* 22:30).

<sup>9</sup> lumen caecis oculis non videbam! (*Ep.* 22:30).

<sup>10</sup> interim parabantur exsequiae (*Ep.* 22:30).

<sup>11</sup> Iuppiter omnipotens et mehercule et mecastor (*Ep.* 21:13-14)

priests of God who have continued to read non-Christian works: ‘We see them reading the comedies, singing amorous words from bucolic poems, clinging to Virgil, and voluntarily making themselves guilty of what schoolboys did out of necessity.’<sup>12</sup> Jerome defends his pagan learning by reminding his audience that his childhood study was compulsory while also decrying its perpetuation by adult Christians. Jerome argues that the knowledge of the profane is not at fault, but rather its perpetuation into Christian adulthood. Despite the seemingly strident reproach of the pagan in the early 380’s, a mere seventeen years after the famous letter to Eustochium, Jerome dismisses his hallucinatory vow as a frivolous hang-up of a sick and misguided youth. In this instance, he is under criticism for the very same accusation of secularity that drove him to describe the event in the first place; Jerome is now in a particular bind as he is accused by his childhood companion-cum-rival Rufinus of breaking his dream oath. Instead of dodging the issue, Jerome welcomes the accusation to finally defend his pagan influences and turns the ad hominem attacks back in the direction of his critics.

The vow to abstain from the pagan classics was never kept, as we have seen from the letters written just shortly after when dream itself is dated and Jerome’s own admission of teaching his pagan influences to his students in Bethlehem.<sup>13</sup> When Jerome continued to not only read but teach the pagan classics, his critics raged at him again.<sup>14</sup> Yet, the dream was never considered a true vow by Jerome as he mocks those who ever thought such a fantastical recollection was a binding admission of former guilt. Attacked on all sides by critics of his literary tendencies, the dream was an altogether convenient device at this point for Jerome; I agree with the argument put

---

<sup>12</sup> uidemus comoedias legere, amatoria bucolicorum uersuum uerba cantare, tenere Vergilium, et id quod in pueris necessitatis est crimen in se facere uoluntatis (Ep. 21:13).

<sup>13</sup> *Apologia contra Rufinum*, especially 2.11, Rebenich (London, 2002) 131 for a discussion on his espousal of Western literature while later in the Near East.

<sup>14</sup> Hagendahl (1958) 323-328. Johannes Geffcken argues that Jerome never followed the dream, “Antike Kulturkämpfe” *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 29 (1912) 606. So too Adkin (2003) 275. pace Grützmacher (1901-1908) 154, Hagendahl (1958) 323-328, Rebenich (2002) 131



forward by Jean Steinmann which emphasises Jerome's later treatment of this 'dream' in the *Apologia adversus libri Rufini* as a folly of his youth.<sup>15</sup> The work, as polemical as its title would suggest, angrily responds to the criticism that he teaches the secular at his monastery levied by his erstwhile companion, Rufinus. In section 30 of the first book of this *Apologia* he sarcastically criticises the need for defence: 'Now it is necessary that I respond to this accusation of sacrilege and perjury on account of a dream!'<sup>16</sup> He continues with a defence from Virgil, 'such are customs formed in tender youth,'<sup>17</sup> as if to say that his misinterpretation was just a foolish result of his adolescence. In his typically polemical style, he infuriates his critics by using the very cause of his condemnation against his accusers. In the following section 31, Jerome lays to rest the criticism using prophetic dreams as a model: 'Dreams should not be trusted! For the dream of adultery does not damn me to hell, nor the dream of martyrdom raise me to heaven!'<sup>18</sup>

It is evident that Jerome had sought now to impress upon his wider audience his renewed zeal for the production of exegetical works. This *Ep. 22* was produced earlier in his Roman period, and would thus be necessarily dated pre-Gospel edition. The text he used for his new commitment to Gospel citations in his writing can be extracted and compared to available *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate traditions. As in most of the examples in this dissertation, Jerome had a heavy preference for citations from *Matthew*. I have set all of the Gospel references in *Ep. 22* with their text as cited in the letter alongside its accepted Vulgate counterpart. Although altogether unsurprising due to its early date,

---

<sup>15</sup> Jean Steinmann, *Saint Jérôme*, (1959) 41-44 discusses the triplicate treatment of the same dream over different periods of Jerome's life: at the time of the dream, he seemed to calculate its cause as simply fervor caused by fever; in his famous letter, the dream is a retribution given directly by God; finally, some twenty-seven years after the event, he brushes it off as a folly

<sup>16</sup> Nunc quod instat, pro sacrilegio atque periuria somnii respondendum est (*Apol. adv. Libri Rufini* 1:30).

<sup>17</sup> adeo in teneris consuescere multum est (*Georg. 2:272*).

<sup>18</sup> Somniis non esse credendum, quia nec adulterium somnii ducit me ad tartarum, nec corona martyrii in coelum levat! (*Apol. adv. Libri Rufini* 1:31).

the non-Vulgate nature of the text lends some clues as to Jerome's earliest text of the Gospels.

Some differences found between *Ep.* 22 and the Vulgate will later be cited by Jerome in his later career as closer to the Vulgate. For example, *Matthew* 6:25 in *Ep.* 22.31 reads '*ne cogitetis in corde uestro*,' a common *Vetus Latina* rendering found in *a b c f g*<sup>1</sup> (nec) *q*. However, when Jerome pens his *Commentary on Matthew* (as discussed at length in a following chapter on this text) he uses a more Vulgate-like '*ne solliciti sitis animae uestrae*'. It is tempting to catalogue this as a piece of evidence of Jerome's evolution toward, and thus authorship of the Vulgate translation. However, other examples in *Ep.* 22 point in the direction of consistency *against* unique Vulgate forms.

*Matthew* 8:20, as presented in *Ep.* 22.21, presents evidence for *nidos* in favour of the Vulgate *tabernacula*. This specific instance is discussed at length in the corresponding chapter, but is notable here for Jerome's usage of the *Vetus Latina* form before his supposed editorial period. Furthermore, at *Ep.* 22.41 Jerome cites *Matthew* 21:9 in a standard *Vetus Latina* form. Rather than the notable shift in the Vulgate to *altissimis*, here Jerome maintains the liturgical and well-established *excelsis*. Again, this will be discussed below but bears mentioning here to further establish the scholar's consistency of forms.

While *Ep.* 22 is not as valuable a vector of Gospel citations as other texts yet to be considered due to its rather small inventory, it is invaluable as a point of contact in Jerome's Roman yet pre-editorial days. Jerome fights for recognition as a true exegetical scholar devoted to the study of religious texts. In so doing, he reveals the texts at his disposal. A perusal of the table following this chapter of citations in *Ep.* 22 immediately shows that his text was *Vetus Latina*; and although the scant evidence does not allow an assignment to a specific family of manuscripts, those available do point to an early family not far removed from *a b*. Throughout the following examinations,

recognition of similarities between early works such as *Ep. 22* and later works such as the *Commentary on Matthew* demonstrate Jerome's preferences throughout his career. Thus, if Jerome uses *excelsis* before, during, and after his period of Roman collation this word must be considered a properly *Hieronymian* rendering.

### *Against Helvidius*

After the publication of *Ep. 22*, Jerome became more comfortable with this sort of exegetical weaving of citations. He would later perform another grand attempt at theological defense of virginity in *Against Helvidius*. At about the same time Jerome presented his new compilation and critical edition of the Four Gospels to Damasus in 383, Jerome's scholarly opinion was solicited to comment on a dangerous assault on the controversial eastern ascetic lifestyle Jerome had imported to the capital. A certain Helvidius had penned a work which logically assailed the arguments for the Perpetual Virginity of Mary and furthermore threatened monastic asceticism's stricture that marriage was an inferior state of living to the life of mortification for which Jerome would come to be seen as a moral champion. Jerome's rebuttal is remarkable for its piecemeal and exegetically learned deconstruction of Helvidius's argument, unfortunately lost except for the quotations borne in the work of Jerome. The piece is important not only for the interested reader of Jerome who can plainly see the development of the scholar's assured style to the point of being brash, but also for the early solidification of the Roman Church's strict support for sexual purity and high Mariology. Kelly succinctly sums the effect of Jerome's rebuttal:

'Helvidius disappeared from the scene, his teaching discredited; the perpetual virginity of Mary became the official orthodoxy; consecrated celibacy was hailed by Catholic Christians as the noblest state; the view of marriage that prevailed was the negative one that it was 'a remedy against sin', to be used exclusively for the propagation of children, certainly not for mutual enjoyment.' (p. 106).

By Christmas 384 Damasus was dead and Jerome was not elected to be his successor, an expectation he apparently held.<sup>19</sup> Rather, Jerome had finally ruffled one too many feathers of the Roman elite and found himself on the shores of Rome in August 385 prepared to embark on his final departure to live the rest of his life in the East, the home of his ascetic beliefs and the place of his remarkable productivity yet to come. Before his departure, he writes to one of his female admirers Asella and urges her as a ‘model of chastity and virginity’ to vouch for him and keep his teachings despite the attacks levied against him (*Ep.* 45). Jerome had hit his stride and intended to keep marching to the beat of his own drum, even in defeat.

While this discussion does not seek to analyze the espousal of sexual purity found in the writings of Jerome, it does bear mention of the above context in order to understand the saint’s state of mind during this period. As in *Ep.* 22 above, the saint was back on his campaign for the promotion of ascetic virginity. With his Gospel edition well under way, Jerome published *Against Helvidius* – perhaps the Church’s most important single tract on early Mariology and her Perpetual Virginity – and was considered the presumptive successor for the Bishop of Rome. Yet, despite his apparent exile just two years subsequent, this support would persist for the remainder of his life, even if he had not been granted his dream job and should never return to play a direct role in day-to-day Roman politics. However, at the time *Against Helvidius* was published Jerome was still on top of the hierarchy of ecclesiastical politics and was in a powerful position to advocate for his recent production of his Latin Gospels.

Jerome’s attack on Helvidius naturally required an in-depth examination of the Gospel accounts of Mary, specifically regarding various nuances in meanings for betrothal versus marriage, and the question whether the evangelist meant to say that conjugal union had existed after the birth of Christ. Jerome uses only Latin quotations

---

<sup>19</sup> Kelly (1975) p. 111.

of the Gospels (and Scripture as a whole, with a notable exception to be discussed below). Given the proximity with which this paper was published in relation to Jerome's revision of the Gospels for Damasus, it would be reasonable to expect that the text would follow a Vulgate edition of the Gospel text.

Unfortunately *Against Helvidius* (*AH*) lacks a critical edition and thorough commentary beyond the Migne edition and its peculiar misreadings and occasional typographical errors. For an English edition, we are left with Hritz in volume 53 of the series *The Fathers of the Church*.<sup>20</sup> It will be necessary, therefore, to at times provide commentary to the text in order to gain further insight. Our primary focus will be on the biblical text found in *AH* and its level of equivalence in our received Vulgate. In so doing, the intention is to demonstrate Jerome's Gospel text at the closest possible point of contact to his final days in Rome.

The proximity of Jerome's publication of his Gospel Translation as symbolised by his prefatory epistle to Damasus and *Against Helvidius* (*AH*) based on historical evidence is certain; both were completed within Jerome's short stay in Rome. Stylistic renderings found in both documents further support their close provenance. Jerome uses a similar analogy in both *AH* and the *Preface to the Gospels* of sources of water to explain the necessities of a proper collation and translation, as follows:

Against Helvidius	Vulgate Introduction to the Gospels
(8) Nec necesse est nunc de exemplariorum uarietate tractare, cum omne et veteris et nouae Scripturae instrumentum in Latinum sermonem exinde translatus sit, et multo purior manare credenda sit fontis unda, quam riui.	(22-23) Hoc certe cum in nostro sermone discordat et diuersos riuulorum tramites ducit, uno de fonte quaerendum est.

<sup>20</sup> John N. Hritz, *Saint Jerome: Dogmatic and Polemical Works* (1965).

Having sought this original source and presumably believing that he found it, Jerome promoted his work not only in the preface to his Damasine revision, but carried the same argument through to his polemic against Helvidius. It is reasonably presumed that the text found within *AH* must be identical – permitting for occasional scribal transmission errors – to the edited text which accompanies Jerome’s Gospel preface. And when Jerome tells us of his reticence to gratify Helvidius with a response (1-2), he need only *ipsa Scripturarum verba ponenda sunt*, that is, let the Scripture itself do the talking. But this very Scripture may also be justifiably presumed to be the Vulgate text. After all, Jerome uses only Latin versions of Scriptural quotations, and at times within *AH* proposes translations that vary from his reported version of *Against Helvidius*. The truth laid bare through the following evidence is that this cannot be so. The text of the Scripture proposed even in Jerome’s rebuttal statements differ from our received Vulgate Gospels.

Furthermore, the *Preface* itself is a frustrating piece of evidence for Hieronymian attribution. While it provides no direct citations itself which can connect Jerome to the Vulgate, it unquestionably is addressed from Jerome to Damasus in the Stuttgart consensus. However, when included in a Vulgate Gospel MSS it need not even include the initial line using the word ‘Jerome’. In other words, our best connection between Jerome and Vulgate is itself inconsistent.

*AH*, on the other hand, lets slip the same sort of language found in its putatively contemporaneous *Preface*. Thus, the author of *AH* (Jerome) and the *Preface* to the Vulgate Gospels both use the same unique analogy to explain their theories of translation. This parallelism is difficult to deny. Not only, then, does it confirm the origin of the *Preface* but also it further emphasises the possibility of *AH* providing the earliest point of contact for Jerome’s Gospel translations. As is fitting for this dissertation as a whole (and perhaps owing to Jerome’s own preference) the text makes

heavy use of *Matthew*. These comparisons, especially for *Matthew*, form the bulk of this dissertation's attempt to understand the true text of Jerome's gospel text in the chapters to follow. These two texts on *Matthew* and *Mark* are critical for their direct lemmatization of the text Jerome must have had available for the purpose of commentary. As for the following section on *AH*, so too must Jerome have had some gospel text available, but the treatment is not so systematic as the two commentaries to follow, nor does it progressively move through a single gospel for the purpose of textual criticism. Rather, *AH* seeks to pick apart Helvidius's arguments and thus makes rather more sporadic and inconsistent usage of the four gospels.

There are multiple reasons one might propose to address these problems. Perhaps Jerome had completed his revision for Damasus and now was either citing inaccurately from memory or had simply not maintained a personal copy. There are, by my estimation, only three other possible solutions to mitigate these discrepancies. First, scribal transmission errors in the independently copied Vulgate and *AH* have caused for differences in form. Second, Jerome may have not yet completed the Gospel revision at the time of *AH*'s publishing. Third, the text that is called Vulgate differs from the gospel text in *AH* because they have distinct authorship traditions, *i.e.* Jerome did not revise the Vulgate Gospels as we have them today. The first option provides perhaps the simplest explanation; however, this dissertation as a whole will show that Jerome's demonstrable gospel texts are often consistently variable from the expected Vulgate readings. Such consistencies suggest that Jerome's gospel text is necessarily different, and thus cannot be so easily explained as the fault of scribal error. The second option is unlikely; as shown above, Jerome's similar analogy in both the *AH* and the Gospel Preface suggests the two were written simultaneously during his productive period under the patronage of Damasus. The third is on its face iconoclastic and disputes the central thesis of the

Vulgate's creation. It is on this theory – that is, that Jerome's gospel text is not the Vulgate Gospels – that this dissertation will focus.

The course of this dissertation was first set along its current path by the observation of consistent differences latent in this work. For example, a significant and curious difference between *AH* and the Vulgate is found in Jerome's treatment of *Matthew* 1:24-5. Section 5 of the *AH* follows the later expected Vulgate in *cognoscebat*, and yet sections 3 and 7 both prefer *cognouit* to render the term. Now, in each of these three examples Jerome is apparently recording the arguments of Helvidius and thus may be citing from a text with which he disagrees. However, our critically important Hieronymian source for *Matthew*, the *Commentary on Matthew*, provides evidence for Jerome's continued usage of the term in the late fourth century. Such a lexical variation may appear superficial, but in reality was the sort of issue upon which Jerome based his argument in favour of virginity: at what time, if any, did Joseph *know* Mary?

Small differences are found throughout this work. It is natural and expected that such variations may prove to be inconsistent in such an early work. Such inconsistencies only become bizarre upon observation that this would be the exact time period in which the scholar was meant to have been publishing the Vulgate itself. With this in mind, I should now like to turn our attention to Jerome's introductory chapter on his Gospel translations.

### **Preface to the Vulgate Gospels**

Having considered the significant differences between the *AH* and the Vulgate as we have come to know it, let us now consider the text with which it is so connected, the *Preface*. The *Preface* was ostensibly written by Jerome to introduce his collation and translation of the four Gospels. Its role in posterity would be to attribute the following



Gospels, and indeed the following text in general, as the translation work of Jerome. Its introduction, 'Jerome to Blessed Pope Damasus', associates the saint with the Vulgate. It then continues in lamenting the difficulty of the work that Jerome here suggests to have been 'coerced' by his patron. The following section of the *Preface* details Jerome's critical method through an apologetic explanation of editorial restraint and preference for Greek originals. Finally, Jerome provides detailed instructions on the usage of the Eusebian Canons he has included with his work.

The very first line, *Beato papae Damaso Hieronymus*, is the text's only connective link of attribution. Its inclusion serves as a colophon for the Gospel translations to follow. Given the lack of attribution in the *Primum Quaeritur* introduction to Paul (see chapter on *Primum Quaeritur* below) it is easy to surmise that this attribution may have been carried for all of the documents that followed, Gospel or otherwise.<sup>21</sup> Given this line's regular usage in the manuscripts, it follows that it was regarded as an integral part. Thus, this line gives this *Preface* the only consistent attribution of the following material to Jerome at the behest of Damasus.

This behest was curiously described in the following line: *nouum opus facere me cogis ex ueteri*. The rhetorical effect was meant to deflect any criticism of his editorial innovations away from himself and onto the Pontiff. As he states in lines 10-12, 'Against this opprobrium there are two things that comfort me: (1) that you who are the highest cleric ordered it be done, and (2) though even now I am tested by the claims of slanderers, that Truth is constant.'<sup>22</sup> In other words, Jerome's 'restrained' efforts were encouraged by the Church's highest authority to whom complaints may be taken.

The apologetic reference to the constancy of truth is stated further in lines 22-3, as mentioned above in the analysis of *Against Helvidius*. Jerome's stated intention to

<sup>21</sup> However, as noted in Weber Gryson (2007), *apparatus criticus* p. 1515, this line was not included in the later Clementine editions that included the *Preface*. The 1592 Clementine edition did not include the *Preface* at all. It was included only in the 1593 & 1598 editions; Weber Gryson (2007), xxxiv.

<sup>22</sup> *Aduersum quam inuidiam duplex causa me consolatur: quod et tu qui summus sacerdos es fieri iubes, et uerum non esse quod uariat etiam maledicorum testimonio conprobatur.* [Preface Ins. 10-12].

seek the *fonte*, ‘source’, of the *diuersos riuulorum tramites*, ‘various streams of little rivers’, demonstrates his desire to seek original text verity from the Greek source. The muddied rivulets were in his view created by *uitiosis interpretibus ... praesumptoribus inperitis ... librariis dormitantibus*, ‘terrible translators, inexperienced guessers, sleepy secretaries’, who diverted from the source through their lack of precision and skill. It was Jerome’s duty to correct these diversions through his search of the original.

The final section of the *Preface* introduces the inclusion of the Eusebian canon tables. In a particularly detailed explanation, Jerome provides instructions on how to use the system in his translation. I cite here some of D.C. Parker and his English indications for the proper usage of the Eusebian tables, and suggest that the longer section in his work (10.3.1) should be referenced by those wishing to know more on the topic:

... the number of the table containing that paragraph number is written underneath every paragraph number in the margin of the text. Thus, in seeing paragraph 64 in Mark with the number 1 beneath it, I know that this paragraph comes in all four Gospels. If I turn to table 1, I find that the parallel paragraphs in the other four are 147 in *Matthew*, 93 in Luke, and 49 in John. I can then look it up in each Gospel and compare the accounts.<sup>23</sup>

After summarizing the various tables (lines 43-8) Jerome continues to describe their utilization:

Different numbers in individual Gospels increase starting from the beginning to the end of the books. Here a number is written above in black ink and has below another number coloured in red ink, which demonstrates to which of the ten tables to go to, whereas the first (black) number indicates where in the canon it might be sought. Therefore, with the book open, for example, if you should wish to know whether this or another chapter is in which canon, you will be instructed right away by the number placed below (red), and turning back to the beginning of this volume in which the canons divide the collection, and straightaway from locating the same number from the canon in the front, by the number with which you were looking for in the Evangelist, you will discover it indicated from this inscription, and as you inspect similar parts from other tracks, you will note the numbers they have in that part. And when you know (the number), you return to the volume of the individual numbers without delay,

<sup>23</sup> D.C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, (2008), 315-6.

you locate the numbers which before you had indicated, and thus you will find the location in which are said the same thing, or something like it. (lines 48-59)<sup>24</sup>

Of course, the system was not an innovation of Jerome's own creation. He had adopted the tables that were in his time gaining in prominence since their supposed creation by the eponymous Eusebius.

Taken as a whole, the introductory *Preface* provides a link between Jerome and the ensuing Gospel translations. However, I reiterate that, while the *Preface* was likely the work of Jerome, it need not have been intrinsic to the translations to which it is traditionally connected. As discussed above, the Vulgate is a diverse collection of translation and commentary (capitula and prefaces); just as the Epistles cannot be easily connected to Hieronymian authorship (*c.f.* the chapter on Vulgate Paul, below) so too is attributing the Gospel translations based on an included *Preface* a specious endeavour. Rather, the *Preface* must be considered as a unique entity of likely Hieronymian origin that has led to the potential mischaracterisation of the material that it introduces. At any rate, it provides evidence that Jerome did operate in some capacity as a Gospel translator and can be interestingly tied to his contemporary work, *Against Helvidius*.

---

<sup>24</sup> Jerome's *Preface* 48-59. The remainder of this section in both Latin and my interlinear English translation can be found in the following section's table.

## Chapter 4

### Text and Comparisons: The Roman Works

#### Gospel citations in *Epistle 22* (383-4 CE)

In the tables to follow, I have presented twenty-one easily identifiable citations in Jerome's *Epistle 22* in parallel consideration with the accepted Vulgate tradition. It should serve as supplementary material to better understand Jerome's text of the Gospels in the early part of his short Roman career.

#### Matthew

(Section) Chapter:Verse	Ep. 22	Vulgate
(5) 5:28	Qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum iam moechatus est eam in corde suo	Qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam iam moechatus est eam in corde suo
(19) 19:11	Non omnes capiunt uerbum Dei, sed hi quibus datum est	Non omnes capiunt uerbum istud sed quibus datum est
(21) 8:20 <sup>1</sup> [ <i>Ep. 22</i> matches <i>CM</i> ]	Uulpes foueas habent et uolucres caeli <b>nidos</b> ; Filius autem hominum non habet, ubi caput reclinet	Uulpes foueas habent et uolucres caeli <b>tabernacula</b> Filius autem hominis non habet, ubi caput reclinet
(22) 24:13	Qui <b>perseuerauerit</b> usque <b>ad</b> finem hic saluus erit	Qui autem <b>permanserit</b> usque <b>in</b> finem hic saluus erit
(22) 20:16	Multi uocati, pauci autem electi	Multi <b>sunt enim</b> uocati pauci autem electi
(24) 23:38	Relinquetur uobis domus uestra deserta	Relinquitur uobis domus uestra deserta
(25) 7:14	Arta et angusta uia est, quae ducit ad uitam	Quam angusta <b>porta</b> et arta uia quae ducit ad uitam

<sup>1</sup> Stuttgart disagrees with Oxford in maintaining *nidos* as the Vulgate rendering. See *CM* chapter. Regardless, *nidos* seems to be the solid *VL* option, seen in *Vercell.* and *Veron.* and *tabernacula* appears to be the Vulgate innovation. Not in S

(30) 6:21	Ubi thesaurus tuus, ibi et cor tuum	Ubi <b>enim est</b> thesaurus tuus, ibi est et cor tuum
(31) 6:24	Nemo potest duobus dominis servire; aut enim unum <b>odiet</b> et alterum <b>amabit</b> , aut unum <b>patietur</b> et alterum contemnet. Non potestis Deo servire et mammonae.	Nemo potest duobus dominis servire; aut enim unum <b>odio habebit</b> et alterum <b>diliget</b> , aut unum <b>sustinebit</b> , et alterum contemnet. Non potestis Deo servire et mammonae [diliget ZF]
(31) 6:25-6	Ne <b>cogitetis</b> in <b>corde uestro</b> , quid manducetis, neque corpori uestro, quid induamini. Nonne anima plus est quam esca et corpus plus est quam uestimentum? Respicite uolatilia caeli, quoniam non serunt neque metunt neque congregant in horrea et Pater uester caelestis pascit illa.	Ne <b>solliciti</b> sitis <b>animae uestrae</b> , quid manducetis, neque corpori vestro, quid induamini. Nonne anima plus est quam esca et corpus plus est quam uestimentum? Respicite uolatilia caeli, quoniam non serunt neque metunt neque congregant in horrea et Pater vester caelestis pascit illa. [CM]
(31) 6:28	Si uestis defuerit, lilia proponentur	Et de uestimento quid solliciti estis, considerate lilia agri quomodo crescunt non laborant nec nent
(32) 6:33	<b>Quaere</b> primum regnum <b>Dei</b> et haec omnia <b>adponentur</b> tibi	<b>Quaerite autem</b> primum regnum et iustitiam eius et omnia haec <b>adicientur</b> uobis
(38) 12:49	Ecce mater mea et fratres mei	Ecce mater mea et fratres mei
(40) 11:12	Regnum caelorum uim patitur et uiolenti diripiunt illud	Regnum caelorum uim patitur et uiolenti rapiunt illud
(41) 21:9	Osanna in <b>excelsis</b> ; benedictus, qui <b>uenit</b> in nomine Domini, osanna in <b>excelsis</b> .	Osanna <b>Filio David</b> , benedictus qui <b>uenturus est</b> [CM] in nomine Domini, osanna in <b>altissimis</b> .

(21) 8:34	<b>Qui</b> uult uenire post me, <b>neget</b> [Z Φ] se ipsum <b>sibi</b> et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me	<b>Si quis</b> uult post me <b>sequi</b> , <b>deneget se</b> ipsum et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me
-----------	--	---

**Luke**

(17) 24:32	Nonne cor nostrum erat ardens in uia, cum aperiret nobis <b>Iesus</b> scripturas?	Nonne cor nostrum ardens erat in <b>nobis dum loqueretur</b> in uia et aperiret nobis scripturas?
(24) 10:41-2	Martha, Martha, sollicita es et turbaris <b>circa</b> plurima; <b>pauca autem necessaria sunt aut unum</b> . Maria <b>bonam</b> partem elegit, quae non auferetur ab ea.	Martha, Martha sollicita es et turbaris <b>erga</b> plurima; <b>porro unum est necessarium</b> . Maria <b>optimam</b> partem elegit, quae non auferetur ab ea.
(31) 16:12	Si in alieno fideles non fuistis, quod uestrum est, quis dabit uobis.	Si in alieno fideles non fuistis, quod uestrum est, quis dabit uobis.

**John**

(1) 8:44	Uos de patre diabolo estis et desideria patris uestri uultis facere.	Uos ex patre diabolo estis et desideria patris uestri uultis facere.
(27) 5:44	Quomodo potestis credere gloriam ab <b>hominibus accipientes</b> ?	Quomodo potestis <b>uos</b> credere <b>qui</b> gloriam ab <b>inuicem accipitis</b> ?

### Jerome's Vulgate Introduction to the Gospels

The following presents the Weber-Gryson recension of the *Praefatio Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri in Euangelio*, the *Preface to the Vulgate Gospels*<sup>1</sup>, with my own interlinear translation. I have chosen to translate their edition as such having been dissatisfied with the availability of English treatments of the *Preface*. Kevin P. Edgecomb has produced a translation on his website<sup>2</sup> which he claims to be the first made into English; however, his effort is at least second by one hundred years to Philip Schaff and Henry Wace.<sup>3</sup> Both translations are useful, but I believe they make a number of errors and confusing choices<sup>4</sup>, and I thus stand by my effort. The reproduction of the Weber-Gryson recension was done for instructive purposes and is not intended to replace their important edition and *apparatus criticus*; any errors in this transmission are fully my own. The recension's line divisions were maintained, and at times make for awkward interlinear matching. I have attempted to mitigate this problem, but have prioritized fluid English over strict matching. I believe that this translation marks the first attempt at an interlinear effort. This translation should supplement the short discussion found in this dissertation's chapter on Jerome's Roman works, above.

### Latin with Interlinear English Translation

<sup>1</sup> *Beato papae Damaso Hieronymus*

Jerome to Blessed Pope Damasus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Taken from Weber Gryson, *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, 1515-1516

<sup>2</sup> [bombaxo.com/jerome.html](http://bombaxo.com/jerome.html). Translation dated 27 July, 1999.

<sup>3</sup> P. Schaff and H. Wace, *Jerome*, vol. 6 *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Series (1893) 487-8.

<sup>4</sup> For example, Schaff and Wace employ anachronistic notions of the Vulgate from the very first line, translating '*Nouum opus facere me cogis ex ueteri*' as 'You urge me to revise the Old Latin version'. Edgecomb's ln. 10-12 very literally, but rather confusingly are translated as 'that it is you, who are the highest priest, who so orders, and truth is not to be what might vary, as even now I am vindicated by the witness of slanderers.'

*Noum opus facere me cogis ex ueteri, ut post exemplaria Scripturarum*

You coerce me to make a new work from the old, that, according to the examples of Scripture

*toto orbe dispersa quasi quidam arbiter sedeam et, quia inter se uariant*

spread out all over the world, I might sit as some sort of Arbiter that wherever they might vary among themselves,

*quae sint illa quae cum graeca consentiant ueritate decernam. Pius labor,*

I might sort out which of those might truly correspond with the Greek. It is a pious work,

<sup>5</sup> *sed periculosa praesumptio iudicare de ceteris ipsum ab omnibus iudicandum, senis*

but a dangerous presumption, to change the language of old and drag the aging

*mutare linguam et canescentem mundum ad initia retrahere paruulorum. Quis enim*

world back to the beginning of its childhood, for in judging the work of others one must himself be judged by all.

*doctus pariter uel indoctus, cum in manus uolumen adsumpserit et a salua quam semel*

Is there not a single man whether learned or not who upon taking this volume into

*inbibit uiderit discrepare quod lectitat, non statim erumpat in uocem, me falsarium*

his hand, once he has taken a taste and sees what he eagerly reads to be different, would not burst out in speech,

*me clamans esse sacrilegum, qui audeam aliquid in ueteribus libris addere, mutare*

shouting that I am a forger and sacrilegious, since I dare add, change or correct anything in the old books?

<sup>10</sup> *corrigere? Aduersum quam inuidiam duplex causa me consolatur: quod et tu qui*

Against this opprobrium there are two things that comfort me: (1) that you who

*summus sacerdos es fieri iubes, et uerum non esse quod uariat etiam maledicorum*

are the highest cleric orders it be done, and (2) though even now I am tested by the

*testimonio conprobatur. Si enim latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant*

claims of slanderers, that Truth is constant. If faith must be placed upon the Latin examples, they might respond



*quibus; tot sunt paene quot codices. Sin autem ueritas est quaerenda de pluribus, cur*  
 “upon which Latin examples?” There are nearly as many as there are books. If however the true meaning is sought from those many, why

*non ad graecam originem reuertentes ea quae uel a uitiosis interpretibus male edita*  
 not correct them returning to the Greek original since they are poorly edited by terrible translators,

<sup>15</sup> *uel a praesumptoribus inperitis emendata peruersius uel a librariis dormitantibus aut*  
 or corruptly emended by inexperienced guessers, or by sleepy secretaries

*addita sunt ut mutata corrigimus? Neque uero ego de Ueteri disputo Testamento,*  
 were added to and changed? Of course I do not here discuss the Old Testament,

*quod a septuaginta senioribus in graecam linguam uersum tertio gradu ad nos usque*  
 which by Seventy superiors was translated into the Greek tongue and comes to us through three different steps.

*peruenit. Non quaero quid Aquila quid Symmachus sapiant, quare Theodotion inter*  
 I seek not what Aquila nor Symmachus may understand, nor how Theodotion

*nouos et ueteres medius incedat; sit illa uera interpretatio quam Apostoli probauerunt.*  
 may stride the middle between the old and the new; this very well may be the translation that the Apostles endorsed.

<sup>20</sup> *De Nouo nunc loquor Testamento, quod graecum esse non dubium est, excepto*  
 I speak rather now on the New Testament, which is not doubted to be Greek, except for

*Apostolo Mattheo qui primus in Iudaea euangelium Christi hebraeis litteris edidit.*  
 the Apostle Matthew, who first published the Gospel of Christ in Judea in the Hebrew language.

*Hoc certe cum in nostro sermone discordat et diuersos riuulorum tramites ducit unio,*  
 It is thus when in our language there is discord and it is led out from its unity into various streams of little rivers,

*de fonte quaerendum est. Praetermitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nun-*  
 that the source must be sought. I omit those codices attributed to Lucianus and Hesychius,

*cupatos paucorum hominum adserit peruersa contentio, quibus utique nec in Ueteri*

of which few men uphold their corrupted contents, who in any case were not allowed to edit the Old

<sup>25</sup> *instrumento post septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit nec in Nouo profuit*

material after the Seventy translators nor was it beneficial to edit the New,

*emendasse, cum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse*

and since the Scriptures had already been translated into the languages of many peoples, that which was

*quae addita sunt.*

added may be shown to be false.

*Igitur haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur quattuor tantum euangelia, quorum*

Thus, this present little introduction offers just the Four Gospels, for which

*ordo iste est Mattheus Marcus Lucas Iohannes, codicum graecorum emendata con-*

the order is Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, by collectively corrected from only old Greek

<sup>30</sup> *latione sed ueterum. Quae ne multum a lectionis latinae consuetudine discrepant*

volumes. Lest there be many places that disagree with the accustomed Latin readings,

*ita calamo imperauimus ut, his tantum quae sensum uidebantur mutare correctis*

I have governed my (editorial) pen, so that only so much as those that seem to have changed in sense are corrected.

*reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant.*

The rest I have allowed to remain as they were.

*Canones quoque, quos Eusebius caesariensis episcopus alexandrinum secutus Am-*

So too I put forward The Canons of Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, following

*monium in decem numeros ordinauit, sicut in graeco habentur expressimus, quo si quis*

Ammonius of Alexandria who ordered them in ten tables as they have in the Greek, so that if

<sup>35</sup> *de curiosis uoluerit nosse quae in euangelis uel eadem uel uicina uel sola sint, eorum*

by curiosity you want to know whether something in the Gospels is in each, another, or occurs alone,

*distinctione cognoscat. Magnus siquidem hic in nostris codicibus error inoleuit, dum*  
it is known by distinguishing them as such. A great error impinges upon our codices, since

*quod in eadem re alius euangelista plus dixit, in alio quia minus putauerint addide-*  
while one Evangelist said more about a certain topic, the others who said less on it, they (the scribes)  
added

*runt; uel dum eundum sensum alius aliter expressit, ille qui unum e quattuor primum*  
to them. Or, while the same sense is expressed among one and another, that which the scribe reads first of  
the four,

*legerat, ad eius exemplum ceteros quoque aestimauerit emendandos. Unde accidit*  
the others are corrected according to the example he esteems. For this reason

<sup>40</sup> *apud nos mixta sint omnia, et in Marco plura Lucae atque Matthei, rursum in Mat-*  
it occurs that in our time all versions are mixed. In Mark there is found a great deal of Luke and Matthew,  
so too in

*theo Iohannis et Marci, et in ceteris reliquorum quae aliis propria sunt inueniantur.*  
Matthew much of John and Mark, but the others of the rest are deemed correct.

*Cum itaque canones legeris qui subiecti sunt, confusionis errore sublato, et similia*  
As you read the canon tables that are placed below, the errors of this disorder having been removed,

*omnium scies et singulis sua quaeque restitues. In canone primo concordant quattuor,*  
you will know the similarities of them all and sort out wherever they may be unique. The first table  
harmonizes the four Gospels:

*Mattheus Marcus Lucas Iohannes; in secundo tres, Mattheus Marcus Lucas; in tertio*  
Matthew Mark, Luke, and John. The second harmonizes three: Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

<sup>45</sup> *tres, Mattheus Lucas Iohannes; in quarto tres, Mattheus Marcus Iohannes; in quinto*  
The third, three: Matthew, Luke, and John. The fourth, three: Matthew, Mark, and John.

*duo, Mattheus Lucas; in sexto duo, Mattheus Marcus; in septimo duo, Mattheus*  
The fifth, two: Matthew and Luke. The sixth, two: Matthew and Mark. The seventh, two: Matthew

*Iohannes; in octavo duo, Lucas Marcus; in nono duo, Lucas Iohannes; in decimo*

and John. The eighth, two: Luke and Mark. The ninth, two: Luke and John. The tenth

*propria unusquisque, quae non habentur in aliis, ediderunt. Singulis euangelii ab uno*

sets forth unique choices in singular editions that the others do not have. Different numbers in individual Gospels

*incipiens usque ad finem librorum dispar numerus increscit. Hic nigro colore prae-*

increase starting from the beginning to the end of the books. Here a number is written above in black ink

<sup>50</sup> *scriptus sub se habet alium ex minio numerum discolorem, qui ad decem usque pro-*

and has below another number coloured in red ink, which demonstrates to which of the

*cedens indicat, prior numerus in quo sit canone requirendus. Cum igitur aperto codice*

ten tables to go to, whereas the first (black) number indicates where in the canon it might be sought. Therefore, with the book open,

*uerbi gratia, illud siue illud capitulum scire uolueris cuius canonis sit, statim ex subiecto*

for example, if you should wish to know whether this or another chapter is in which canon, you will be instructed right away by the number placed below (red),

*numero doceberis, et recurrens ad principia in quibus canonum est distincta congeries,*

and turning back to the beginning of this volume in which the canons divide the collection,

*eodemque statim canone ex titulo frontis inuento, illum quem quaerebas numerum*

and straightaway from locating the same number from the canon in the front, by the number with which you were looking for

<sup>55</sup> *eiusdem euangelistae qui et ipse ex inscriptione signatur inuenies, atque e uicinia cete-*

in the Evangelist, you will discover it indicated from this inscription, and as you inspect similar parts from other tracks,

*rorum tramitibus inspectis, quos numeros e regione habeant adnotabis; et cum scieris,*

you will note the numbers they have in that part. And when you know (the number),

*recurres ad uolumina singulorum et sine mora, repperitis numeris quos ante signaueras,*

you return to the volume of the individual numbers without delay, you locate the numbers which before you had indicated,

*repperies et loca in quibus uel eadem uel uicina dixerunt*

and thus you will find the location in which are said the same thing, or something like it.

<sup>59</sup> *Opto ut in Christo ualeas et memineris mei, papa beatissime.*

I wish that in Christ you are strengthened and that you might remember me, most blessed Pope.

## Chapter 5

### The Gospel of *Matthew*: Jerome's Commentary

#### Background

The *Commentary on Matthew* (CM) provides an invaluable selection of evidence to uncover the text of Jerome's Gospels, especially in its great wealth of Latin lemmata from its titular subject. Writing in the *Journal of Theological Studies* in 1941, Alexander Souter expressed understandable bewilderment that in the '104 incidental quotations made from this Gospel only 33 harmonize with the Vulgate text, while the other 71 are definitely different,' for which he concludes 'from all this it is clear that Jerome had no particular respect for his own revision (which was in any case made to order).'<sup>1</sup> Souter continues to cite statistics that further demonstrate this text, written at the end of the fourth century, had no such 'respect' for the Vulgate document. This claim is rather more important than Souter's brief conclusion may seem. Two possibilities stem from this pronouncement. The first possibility is that Jerome put no stock in his edition of the Gospels produced less than two decades prior and had either purposefully or eventually stopped supporting their authority. Considering Souter's parenthetical notation that because they were mandated under the coercion of the Pope he wished to succeed, the attendant failure of this desire might have overclouded his efforts. The second, and I believe far simpler, option is simply that Jerome was not the author of the Vulgate edition of the Latin Gospels. This chapter's thesis naturally parrots the preceding overarching thesis that when close evidence is considered, very

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexander Souter, 'Notes on Incidental Gospel Quotations in Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel,' *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. 42 (1941), 12-13.

little parallel can be found between the typical Vulgate Latin renderings and the work of Jerome.

It is important to first state that there are more similarities between Jerome and the Vulgate than there are differences. This, as discussed above in the chapter discerning Vulgate from *Vetus Latina*, is a natural evolutionary effect of the various manuscript creator's individual efforts. Indeed, on first read a budding Latinist may very well be left puzzled at any significant difference between the *Vetus Latina* and our centrally important Vulgate. Where we most often establish our landmark differences rests in the peculiarities of lexical and syntactical renderings that the Vulgate edition of the Gospels tends to favour. The first such differences we shall consider are those that in their Latin vocabulary differ (or in a single notable exception, concur) with the Vulgate rendering in ways that provide significant differences in their meaning and theological argument. Such differences in the Vulgate are in many places innovations of that text, and it would follow that the innovator should wish to defend his own translations. Of course, where Jerome differs is where further exploration from other Patristic sources and manuscripts is merited. Our second consideration will be to summarize consistent grammatical and syntactical differences between Jerome's *Matthew* found in the *CM* and that which we expect from the Vulgate tradition. An example to follow is the rather inverse Latin treatment of the Greek preposition εἰς with either the accusative or the ablative case.

The reason I have chosen to forgo Souter's rather more numerical approach to the differences throughout the entirety of the text is simply that the statistics would obfuscate more than they would reveal. For one, the proper segmentation of Jerome's lemmata in a text that flows between commentary and original quotation in a time before versification would be entirely too subjective. The resultant sample size would essentially be of my own manipulation. Furthermore, even if such a result could be

accomplished fairly and systematically, the results would show that somewhere around a half of my established lemmata are different from the Vulgate. However, most of these differences are easily attributed to transmission such as vowel changes (*fulgor* versus *fulgur* at 28:2-3)<sup>2</sup>, inversions (*gaudio magno* versus *magno gaudio* at 28:8), omissions (*et* in *CM* but not Vulgate at 28:6-7), or orthographical differences especially considering foreign words (*clamide* versus *clamydem* at 27:31). Rather, I have endeavoured to demonstrate differences that are either fully consistent throughout the two texts or singularly significant, especially where changes make appreciable theological impact.

Chapman, too, wrote about the *Commentary* in his article defending the entirety of the Vulgate New Testament as Jerome's, and I summarize his arguments here.<sup>3</sup> After acknowledging that Jerome's text was written 'in a fortnight ... in March 398, nearly fourteen years after the revision of the Vulgate Gospels, it has the Vulgate for its text, albeit with a large number of differences.' Chapman then acknowledges a few of these inconsistencies (which themselves are based upon the Oxford edition of the Vulgate) and notes lexical differences in 19:10, 8:20, 8:25, 8:18, 25:1, 26:75, 28:26 and 6:16. He admits, however, 'I have looked up texts at random.' Regardless, Chapman recognized great inconsistencies between the truly Hieronymian text in the *CM* and the Vulgate (Oxford). However, as discussed above in our introductory chapter on the Vulgate tradition, Chapman's article here attempts to defend Hieronymian origin for the totality of the Vulgate New Testament. Furthermore, he takes as a granted reference point that the Vulgate Gospels are Jerome's and is here defending the remainder of the New Testament as Jerome's by showing that inconsistencies found in Hieronymian Pauline

---

<sup>2</sup> An example Fischer gives for the mutability of Latin long *o* and *u*, 'in spite of a different Greek *Vorlage*.' B. Fischer, 'Limitations in Latin in Representing Greek,' in B. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, (1977), p. 372.

<sup>3</sup> J. Chapman, 'St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament,' *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. 24 (1922) 40.



lemmata are *ipso facto* understandable because Jerome is even inconsistent with his Gospel quotations. We should here recall the first line of Chapman's article: 'The question whether St Jerome is the author of the whole Vulgate New Testament, or only of the Gospels, has been much debated.'<sup>4</sup>

I find several issues with Chapman's declarations on the *CM*. First, although his indexing of inconsistencies was self-admittedly sporadic, he still saw them as simply *Vetus Latina* examples that Jerome sprinkled in among his Vulgate exemplars. However, this approach is nonsensical in presuming that Jerome would carry over some unique translations but revert to some found before his translation. This chapter will demonstrate that seemingly Vulgate options in the *CM* can often be established to have either other *Vetus Latina* sources or pre-Vulgate Patristic authors. Second, Chapman downplays the significance of this work based on its hurried construction. I argue that the hurried construction of a text replete with citations relies more than most upon a preexisting and complete Latin *Matthew*. Third and most important, I dispute the central premise of Chapman's argument, namely that Vulgate *Matthew* is intrinsically linked to Jerome and therefore any divergences in Jerome's commentaries are evidence of Jerome's professional inconsistencies. However, this argument relies on the concession that Jerome was the origin of the Vulgate Gospels. If we entertain the idea – which Chapman certainly does not – that Vulgate *Matthew* was not Jerome's, the whole problem becomes much easier to solve: Jerome's *CM* did not fit Vulgate *Matthew* because Vulgate *Matthew* was not Jerome's.

The following chapter will first consider the history of the *Commentary on Matthew* and demonstrate its important historical setting relative to Jerome's career. This will then be followed by the consideration of a few passages in depth that are intrinsically important differences from the Vulgate text. The following section will

---

<sup>4</sup> op. cit. p. 33.

then consider the consistent translational renderings that are significantly different between the *CM* and the Vulgate. Having considered these differences we will again reassess the possibility of, or indeed lack thereof, Jerome's authorship of the Vulgate Gospels.

Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew* lays out the majority of the Gospel in Latin followed by commentary on the section cited. The text gives hundreds of examples of Jerome's copy of the Gospel in Latin as he had it in March 398, a full 15 years after Jerome's Roman experience.<sup>5</sup> Thus, these examples provide a copious source of Hieronymian Latin *Matthew* nearly two decades after his supposed edition submitted to Damasus in the early part of the 380's. It would stand to reason that a Hieronymian Vulgate should match a following Hieronymian commentary. However, as will be discussed in the following chapter, the received Vulgate tradition (as established above and typified by the Stuttgart Vulgate) is often rather different than the text Jerome used for his *Commentary*. As will be demonstrated in the following chapter, a great preponderance of evidence of such divergence can be demonstrated by setting the citations in the *Commentary* in parallel with the accepted Vulgate text as well as considering other *Vetus Latina* editions of *Matthew*. A table of such parallel considerations can be found as reference at the conclusion of the analytical chapter.

Jerome may at times agree with the Vulgate against even a few of our oldest and most complete *Vetus Latina* sources. Early sections as found in the comparison table such as *Matthew* 1:19, 1:23, or 2:2 may lead to the conclusion that Jerome's translation is uniquely similar to the Vulgate if only a few prior sources are consulted. In 1:19, *uoluit occulte dimittere eam* sees *occulte* as *tacite* in *b* and *clam* in *d*. By turning to *a* we

---

<sup>5</sup> Thomas P. Scheck, *St Jerome Commentary on Matthew* (2008) 15 cites J. Quasten *Patrology* 4.235 who notes that Jerome discusses writing the *Commentary* in *Ep.* 73.10.

see that this choice is not unique to Jerome nor the Vulgate. 1:23, which we will return to later in this chapter, has Jerome seemingly arguing for the Vulgate innovation, one which *a b* both lack. However, a consultation with *d* reveals that Jerome's choice is sourced beyond the Vulgate. So too in 2:2 does the Jerome-Vulgate choice of ablative *in oriente* contrast with *a b*'s accusative *in orientem*. Again, further digging into *d* reveals an earlier source for Jerome's choice. The same exercise can be carried on throughout the entirety of this table, and I have collated a number of variations found between Jerome's *CM*, the Vulgate, and *Vetus Latina* MSS in order to facilitate such independent exercises. What would become quickly obvious is that most of these leads are dead-ends, and where Jerome seems to agree with an innovative Vulgate choice an earlier exemplar can be found. Rather, the extraordinary differences such as those discussed below are the points that are irreconcilably *different* between Jerome's work and the Vulgate. After all, some source – found or otherwise – might be behind similarities, but significant departures between the *CM* and the Vulgate are particularly interesting. Such differences, especially when they have significant impact on translation, are indicative of variable translational histories. It is within these variances that I try to reconstruct some of the history of the Vulgate's construction and criticise its supposed authorship.

### **The Creation of the *Commentary***

The *Commentary* is a particularly important text to uncover the Hieronymian source text of *Matthew* given its unique history. We know of its peculiar circumstances of creation from Jerome's own introduction to the text. In order to better appreciate the unique perspective provided by the *CM*, the following short section will analyse this introduction and demonstrate its unique qualities that make it a critical snapshot of Jerome's text of *Matthew*.

The *Commentary* is dedicated to Eusebius of Cremona, and as mentioned above, was completed in March 398, nearly fifteen years after Jerome's departure from Rome.<sup>6</sup> After a short history of the Gospel as Jerome knew it (notably, including the typically Hieronymian belief that *Matthew* was first written in Hebrew) he continues to state the circumstances of the *Commentary*'s creation. In a fashion reminiscent of his introduction to the Gospels addressed to Damasus, as discussed in a previous chapter, Jerome again laments that this work was less than voluntary.

*At tu in duabus ebdomadibus, imminente iam pascha et spirantibus uentis, dictare me cogis... Maxime cum scias me ita tribus mensibus languisse ut uix nunc ingredi incipiam nec possim laboris magnitudinem breuitate temporis compensare. Igitur ommissa auctoritate ueterum quos nec legendi nec sequendi mihi facultas data est. Historicam interpretationem quam praecipue postulasti digessi breuiter et interdum spiritalis intellegentiae flores miscui, perfectum opus reseruans in posterum. [CM Introduction]*

'You force/compel (*cogis*) me to dictate this in two weeks, with Easter upon us and the winds blowing in ... especially when you know me to have languished for three months such that now I am scarcely beginning to walk nor am I able adequately perform such a huge labour in such a brief time. Thus, having disregarded the authority of ancient writers as the opportunity was not afforded me to either read or follow them, **I have quickly laid out the historical interpretation**, which you chiefly requested, and here and there I mixed in flowers of spiritual interpretation, reserving the perfect work for a future time.'

The similarity with the Introductory Letter to Damasus is evident. The scholar is again seeking in advance to mitigate any errors in scholarship by reinforcing the rush under which he undertook his endeavour. Here we have a glimpse into what exactly was requested by Eusebius, 'chiefly...the historical interpretation' of *Matthew*. This phrase is intriguing and suggests a very important fact for our discussion: Jerome had in his possession an *interpretatio* of *Matthew* known at least to Eusebius and viewed as 'historical' which could be dictated rapidly. In other words, the version of *Matthew* in the *CM* in Jerome's possession predates 398 and was recognized as important by

---

<sup>6</sup> J. Chapman, 'St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament,' *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. 24 (1922) 40.

Eusebius. Jerome notes that he ‘quickly,’ *breuiter*, sets this text of *Matthew* out and interweaves it with ‘flowers of spiritual interpretation.’ This adverb critically demonstrates the method in which Jerome dictated and used his ready ‘interpretation’ of *Matthew*. A review of the companion table for this chapter quickly reveals the irregularity with which Jerome’s commentary used *Matthew* for commentary, although he does use the vast majority of *Matthew*.

Consider, then, that Jerome had two weeks to copy (or indeed, dictate) a translation, let alone add his interpretations. It is clear that the *CM* provides an important text of *Matthew* in Jerome’s library. One could easily argue that this text would be the translation made by Jerome himself fifteen years previous; such an obvious claim is further supported by the apparent request by Eusebius for the *historicam interpretationem* – ‘historical interpretation’ – in Jerome’s hands. Thus, the text of *Matthew* in the *CM* satisfies Metzger’s two criteria for valuable Patristic citations: the text is quoted consistently and verbatim, and the long quotations produced in a short period of time suggest the usage of a manuscript.<sup>8</sup> Jerome’s *Matthew* can thus be culled from the *CM* and should represent the best form of his edition in 398. The *CM* is invaluable for its relatively complete text of *Matthew* and its easily dated period of creation. Its hastily formed nature only reinforces our certitude that its Gospel text represents a preëxisting, and indeed honoured, text in Jerome’s possession.

Thus, having uncovered the Hieronymian *Gospel of Matthew* at the turn of the century, the text may be compared with the Vulgate tradition. One could presuppose that, if Jerome is the Vulgate’s source, the *CM*’s text might directly match with or at least be very close to the expected Vulgate forms. However, the remainder of this chapter will demonstrate a number of significant lexical, syntactical, and orthographical dissimilarities. Many of these dissimilarities are small orthographical or transcriptional

---

<sup>8</sup> B. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, (1964) 4<sup>th</sup> ed. B. Ehrman, (2005), 127-8.

issues, and by and large, these cannot be regarded as significant in and of themselves (but may be considered in the accompanying tables). The major differences, however, are particularly striking where the Vulgate makes certain theological changes or makes unique translational choices from the Greek. Jerome as the Vulgate's originator should be expected to follow such innovations. In the following section we will consider a few of the most important verses in which Jerome's *CM* is not in agreement with unique Vulgate translations. Throughout, it is worth considering to what extent, if any, the manuscript from which Jerome drew his *lemmata* can be properly considered Vulgate if it diverges from these defining characteristics of Vulgate *Matthew*.

In our consideration of the traditional Vulgate text of *Matthew*, a number of lexical peculiarities unique to the Vulgate help to define essential differences from the Old Latin MSS. The following section demonstrates a number of these critical innovations and sets them in parallel with the forms used by Jerome in his *CM*. It should become apparent that the forms unique to Vulgate *Matthew* – and perhaps in and of themselves definitional of the tradition – are curiously lacking in the text of *CM*. Where these differences are found, a closer inspection of the possible origins of the Hieronymian examples seeks to uncover his text. Where there are dissimilarities and vague origins, what becomes clear is Jerome's usage of a text quite different from that of the expected Vulgate tradition. What follows is a number of these issues set alongside one another, Jerome's *CM* on the left<sup>9</sup>, and the Vulgate on the right.

### ***Matthew 3:9 potens est v. potest***

**Potens est** Deus de lapidibus istis suscitare  
filios Abrahae.

Quoniam **potest** Deus de lapidibus istis  
suscitare filios Abrahae.

<sup>9</sup> From Emile Bonnard's two volume *Commentaire sur S. Matthieu* (1977 & 1979), produced for Cerf's *Sources Chrétiennes*.

The *CM* exhibits *potens est*, seen widely in *Vetus Latina* and Patristic examples. On the other hand, the Vulgate presents a relatively more innovative choice in the finite *potest*.

Contemporary Patristic evidence widely points to Jerome's choice, *potens est*. Ambrose similarly cites *potens enim deus est...* (*Exp. Psalmi XCIII*). Likewise, Augustine twice repeats this choice in both *In Gal.* 25 and *In Iob.* 28 (the later *Cons. Euang.* 2.12.26 adopts the Vulgate reading).

Jerome, like Augustine, seems to have used the *potens est* form, but the Vulgate form only later in his career. *Ep.* 65.21 uses *potens est* and is dated to the late 390's,<sup>10</sup> making it contemporaneously created along with the *CM*. However, Jerome's *Comm. in Hierem.* 6.1, written at the end of Jerome's career sometime after 414,<sup>11</sup> uses the Vulgate form *potest*. The implications of such later date usage of a Vulgate-like form, especially in Augustine, will be discussed with some detail in the conclusion of this thesis. However, it stands here to state that the *Cons. Euang.*, which includes the Vulgate reading, is considered a benchmark for the introduction of Vulgate forms in the writing of Augustine.<sup>12</sup> Jerome's later usage of a Vulgate-like form may, or may not be significant here. The difference between *potens est* and *potest* is, after all, relatively insignificant both grammatically and theologically. However, if the change is evidence of a significant shift to a Vulgate reading, it is curious that Jerome and Augustine should adopt such conventions around the same time. I will table this discussion for my conclusions on possible origins, but would here like to point the reader to consider such curiosities in the timeline of Vulgate usage. Regardless, the *Comm. Hierem.* is a typical Hieronymian text in that there is considerable discord with the Vulgate tradition. I have

---

<sup>10</sup> 397 in Kelly (1975) 212.

<sup>11</sup> Begun in c. 414, *op. cit* 316.

<sup>12</sup> 'He (Augustine) begins to cite Jerome's revised text in primary citations from around 403; this featured in his exemplars for both *De consensu euangelistarum* and the *Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium...*' H.A.G. Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John* (2008) 179.

compiled a table illustrative of this fact that will demonstrate the locations of disagreement between Jerome and the Vulgate.

***Matthew 4:5 adsumpsit/adsumit & pinnam/pinnaculum***

Tunc <b>adsumpsit</b> eum diabolus in sanctam	Tunc <b>adsumit</b> eum diabolus in sanctam
ciuitatem	ciuitatem et
Statuit eum <b>super pinnam</b> templi	Statuit eum <b>supra pinnaculum</b> templi

*Matthew 4:5* contains two differences in the *CM* from rather rare choices made in the Vulgate. In the first case, the *CM* follows a clear *Vetus Latina* choice in perfect tense, whereas the Vulgate inherits a rarer choice in present tense (*d* chooses a perfect tense *suscepit*). Codex Veronensis provides clear evidence for Jerome's *CM* choice (whereas it is missing in *a*). Jülicher chooses *adsumpsit* as his consensus form and lists the Vulgate as the earliest example of the present tense choice. The second choice concerns the difference between *pinnam* and the Vulgate's choice of the diminutive *pinnaculum*. Again, Jülicher lists only the late *aur* and *l* in agreement with the Vulgate, places the Vulgate as the earliest example of this diminutive form. Jerome's choice has good precedence in the *Vetus Latina* tradition and I list all of our early examples in the table (chapter 7) as agreeing with the *CM* in *pinnam*. Furthermore, some contemporary Patristic evidence supports Jerome's choice in the *CM*. Augustine has *constituit* (for *statuit*) *super pinnam templi* (*Quaest. Simpl.* 2.3.1).



**Matthew 5:25**

Esto consentiens aduersario tuo cito, dum es	Esto consentiens aduersario tuo cito, dum
<b>cum illo in uia</b> , ne forte tradat te	es <b>in uia cum eo</b> ne forte tradat te
aduersarius iudici et iudex tradat te ministro	aduersarius iudici et iudex tradat te
et in carcerem mittaris.	ministro et in carcerem mittaris.

The *CM* exhibits two variants from the solid and traditional Vulgate reading. Significantly, the *CM* readings find further agreement in Jerome's corpus (*Ep.* 127.3). Jerome's established reading of *Matthew* 5:25 is *esto consentiens aduersario tuo cito, dum es cum illo in uia...* and the Vulgate has *esto consentiens aduersario tuo cito, dum es in uia cum eo*. While the meaning conveyed in both examples is essentially the same, the lexical and syntactical variations found in each example clash. The following analysis demonstrates that it is the Vulgate, and not Jerome, that breaks with well-established order.

The distinct differences set in bold above are evidently Hieronymian preferences as demonstrated by his other citations of this passage. In the late *Ep.* 127 (ca. 413) addressed to Principia, Jerome cites *Matthew* 5:25 as *esto beniuolus siue bene sentiens de aduersario tuo dum es cum illo in uia*. The *CM* choice exhibited in the 390s is continued throughout the saint's late career. I find no evidence of the Vulgate reading anywhere in the writings of Jerome.

The *Vetus Latina* provides precedents for Jerome's choice. The difference found at the end of the citation can be clearly split between Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* (*cum illo in uia*). Jerome's choice is obviously *Vetus Latina* and I have noted exact parallels in *a b d* in table 1 of chapter 7. Jülicher uses the form as his good *Vetus Latina* form and cites the Vulgate's *in uia cum eo* as a variant found in Codices Aureus Holmiensis (*aur*), Corbiensis (*ff*<sup>d</sup>), and Rehdigeranus (*l*) as well as the Vulgate. Notably, each of these Vulgate-matching examples is from rather late exemplars (all about 8<sup>th</sup> Century)

and could have been corrupted by acknowledged Vulgate forms. Jerome, on the other hand, seems to be continuing an otherwise pure and early *Vetus Latina* form.

If the Vulgate is truly the primary example for *in uia cum eo*, Patristic evidence adds an interesting conundrum into the timeline. Augustine uses the Vulgate/*aur ff<sup>1</sup> l* choice in his *De serm. Dom. in monte* 1.29. If, as is stated by Milne,<sup>13</sup> this Augustinian work were written around 393, it would place Augustine's use of a 'Vulgate' form prior to Jerome's work on the *CM* by about four to five years. There is a further *Vetus Latina* manuscript not mentioned above which explains this appearance. Milne's work attempts something similar to our current process for Augustine by placing identifiable citations parallel to Codex Bobiensis (*k*). For *Matthew* 5:25 (p. 7), Milne's parallel with the African *k*, written sometime in the fourth or fifth centuries, leads to a possible source for Augustine. The 'Vulgate' *in uia cum eo* is therefore found as early as *k* and Augustine, but never in the work of Jerome nor the earliest Italian/European *Vetus Latina* MSS.

### ***Matthew 6:16 Exterminant v. Demoliuntur***

<b>Exterminant</b> enim facies suas ut pareant hominibus ieiunantes.	<b>Demoliuntur</b> enim facies suas ut pareant hominibus ieiunantes.
---	---

In this passage, Jesus comments on the hypocrites who self-mutilate, ἀφθανίζουσιν, to publicly exaggerate the effects of their devotional fasting. The Vulgate uses *demoliuntur* to translate the Greek where Jerome chooses the far more widely accepted *exterminant*. *Vetus Latina* Codices Vercellensis and Veronensis use *exterminant* in agreement with Jerome. Jerome writes *exterminantes facies suas*, in his *Ep.* 22.27 produced contemporaneously with his production of the Gospels in Rome.

<sup>13</sup> C.H. Milne, *A Reconstruction of the Old-Latin Text or Texts of the Gospels Used by Saint Augustine*, (1926) p. xii, in which he presents a useful summary table of dates along with his tally of agreements.

Similarly, Ambrose cites the passage in *de Helia et Ieiunio* 10.37 as '*exterminare faciem ... exterminat faciem suam.*'

In light of *Vetus Latina* evidence, *exterminant* seems to have been the preferred form. I record *a b* in agreement with Jerome and Ambrose with *exterminant*. Jülicher uses *exterminant* as his reconstructed *Vetus Latina* form and lists *demoliuntur* as a distinct Vulgate variant. Thus, Jerome was continuing an established lexical usage and did not exhibit the innovation in *demoliuntur* as made by the Vulgate editor.

Augustine's *De serm. Dom. in monte* 2.40 also uses the early *exterminant*, yet varies in replacing *facies suas* with *uultum suum* and *pareant* with *uideantur*. The latter incongruences do not discount the Augustinian evidence for *exterminare*; rather, this usage speaks to the traditional usage of *exterminant* when citing this verse in a pre-Vulgate context. Jerome's text is yet another example of such a treatment.

### ***Matthew 6:27 cogitans***

Quis uestrum <b>potest adicere</b> ad staturam suam	Quis <b>autem</b> uestrum <b>cogitans potest adicere</b>
cubitus unum?	ad staturam suam cubitus unum?

The *CM* and the Vulgate both exhibit translations typical of two distinct identifiable traditions in the treatment of 6:27 in Latin. The missing *cogitans* in Jerome's *CM* is the rarer and earlier of the two translation traditions. Our table (chapter 7, table 1) demonstrates that the word is missing in our earliest MSS (although *d* is here missing entirely). Curiously, Jülicher places the missing *cogitans* in his reconstructed form, despite only the very early *a b h* (and African *k*) indicating such a decision to not include the word. On the other hand, Jülicher has *c f ff<sup>d</sup> g<sup>l</sup> l* as including *cogitans*, and *q* as including *cogitando*. Based on this *Vetus Latina* evidence, it is clear that Jerome had chosen the rarer option and that the Vulgate is in the majority. I have not found a clear precedent for the omission of *autem/enim* as found in the *CM*.

**Matthew 6:34**Nolite solliciti **esse de crastino**.

Sufficit diei malitia sua

Nolite **ergo esse solliciti in crastinum**.

(crastinus enim dies sollicitus erit sibi ipse)

Sufficit diei malitia sua.

Here, Jerome does not significantly depart from the Vulgate. In context with the remainder of evidence, however, it is clear that the Vulgate's variables are innovative. Jerome follows both *a b* in omitting (or, rather, never adding) *ergo* and ordering the line as *nolite solliciti esse*. *Vetus Latina* evidence shows an adhesion, by-and-large, to ancient examples in the *CM* (with a notable exception of the Vulgate *de crastino h*). A noticeable unique departure is found in Jerome's usage of *de* followed by the ablative *crastino*; both *a b* use the *in* plus the accusative *crastinum* as found in the Vulgate. Yet, we can be sure that Jerome's usage of *de* with the *ablative* was a consistent editorial choice in his copy of *Matthew*. A discussion on the treatment of ablatives and accusatives throughout the *CM* and the Vulgate can be found at the conclusion of this chapter.

Further evidence for this ablative, *crastino*, is found repeated in an incidental citation in the above commentary on *Matthew* 6:11. There, despite an understandable shift of *solliciti* to *cogitare* to fit the incidental citation to his editorial objective, Jerome still maintains his *de crastino*. The discussion to come on ablatives and accusatives will further contextualize this problem. In short, when the Greek εἰς is translated into Latin, it can often be expected to be followed by an ablative in the text of the *CM* and an accusative in the text of the Vulgate, with some exceptions. Here, εἰς τὴν αὔριον, follows this pattern giving *CM de crastino* and Vulgate *in crastinum*.

Thus, two small conclusions can be made from Jerome's *Matthew* 6:34. First, in leaving out *ergo* and maintaining the familiar *Vetus Latina* phrasing, it is demonstrative of extra-Vulgate influence. Second, Jerome's text of *Matthew* shows repeated preference for *de crastino* the usage of ablatives following the Greek preposition εἰς.

***Matthew 7:15 uestitu...intus v. uestimentis...intrinsicus***

Adtendite a falsis prophetis qui ueniunt ad uos in	Adtendite a falsis prophetis qui ueniunt ad uos
<b>uestitu</b> ouium, <b>intus</b> autem sunt lupi rapaces.	in <b>uestimentis</b> ouium, <b>intrinsicus</b> autem sunt
	lupi rapaces

Jerome chooses clear *Vetus Latina* lexical options that I argue are landmark differences between the two traditions. Jerome's text in the *CM* does not seem to be innovative, as it mimics *a* and *b* in using *in uestitu ouium*, **intus** ... whereas the Vulgate from the earliest (included in *F*) prefers *in uestimentis ovium*, **intrinsicus**...

Augustine followed a similar tradition as Jerome's *CM* text as, *qui ueniunt ad uos in uestitu ouium* (*De serm. Dom. in monte* 2.78). Given the *Vetus Latina* evidence supporting this usage, it can be considered among the good extra-Vulgate treatments in the Gospel of *Matthew*. The alteration in the Vulgate could then reasonably be expected in the work of its editor.

However, I have only been able to identify one other usage in the work of Jerome in *Ep.* 147.11 which is a paraphrase on *Matthew* 7:15. Regardless, in citing *sub uestitu ouium*, Jerome only exhibits knowledge and usage of *uestitus* over Vulgate *uestimentum* for Greek ἐν ἐνδύμασιν. Furthermore, I find no evidence in the work of Jerome for translating ἔσωθεν as *intrinsicus*, and must believe he only used *intus*. This is significant given that *uestitu ... intus* is a good *Vetus Latina* usage. My table (chapter

7, table 1) lists our examples of *a b d* using *uestitu ... intus* and Jülicher uses the same in his *Itala*, citing late *Vetus Latina* manuscripts and the Vulgate for *uestimentis ... intrinsecus*. As Jerome can only be demonstrated to have knowledge of the older usage, I consider this as relatively strong evidence of his ignorance of later *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate choices.

### ***Matthew 8:7 sanabo v. curabo***

Et ait illi Iesus: Ego ueniam et **sanabo** eum

Et ait illi Iesus: ego ueniam et **curabo** eum

The clear historical choice for Greek θεραπεύσω is *curabo*. In this subsection I will demonstrate its precedence throughout *Vetus Latina* tradition, the Vulgate, and in Patristic evidence. Jerome's choice in *sanabo* appears to be a novel choice and could possibly demonstrate a purer Hieronymian text.

The Vulgate uses *curabo*, and with good reason: all but one *Vetus Latina* text uses the perfectly reasonable *curabo*. The editor of the Vulgate must have recognized the clear precedent for the term and did not choose to alter it. Even the aforementioned single variation, found in Jülicher's *Afra* example *k*, chooses *turabo* which is too orthographically similar when laid against all other *Vetus Latina* evidence to be considered overly significant (i.e. it is likely a small orthographical difference). Augustine provides a point of reference for contemporaneous usage of *curabo* in his *Serm. 77*. Yet, Jerome's use of *sanabo* seems to be a purposeful change. It maintains the tense, mood, and voice but chooses a different lexical root.

**Matthew 8:9**

Ecce ego, <b>cum sim homo</b> , dico huic: uade, et uadit	<b>Nam et ego, homo sum sub potestate habens sub me milites et</b> dico huic: uade, et uadit
--	---

Jerome presents a truncated version of *Matthew* 8:9 along with lexical and verbal mood variations. The significant difference encouraged Migne to act in his characteristically unrestrained manner as he inserted the Vulgate text into his edition of this text.<sup>14</sup> It is necessary to comment on the unique difference found in the *CM* that Migne thought necessary to correct.

*Vetus Latina* evidence suggests that the Vulgate text was not original. As seen in our table (chapter 7, table 1), *a* includes a similarly extended version with *homo sum sub potestatem constitutus habens sub me milites et ...* but omits the *ego* found in the Vulgate example. Additionally, *b* matches this Vulgate example exactly. Indeed, Jülicher does not provide any evidence for Jerome's peculiarities here. He suggests that *nam et* is a standard opening of this passage and that there is no evidence for either the subjunctive *sim* nor the truncated form as found in the *CM*. There is, however, a good deal of variability in the omitted section. The simplest answer for the *CM* is that Jerome shortened this section and maintained its meaning. This is, however, a difficult assertion given that in no other section in this highly lemmatized work is such a truncation apparent. I concede that this unique choice may have been made in this section, but I rather think that Jerome simply had another option available as demonstrated by his *CM*.

The opening in *ecce* presents the situation somewhat differently, but in a logically connected manner. The speaker is the centurion asking Christ to heal his servant, to which Christ asks to be directed to his house. The centurion famously

<sup>14</sup> Migne, *PL* 26, 52: fn. e states: 'Rursum idem MSS' and then lists the form above in *Ecce*.

humbles himself and says that he is not worthy to entertain Christ in his house, despite his relatively high social class. This is where our phrase is concerned. In the standard Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* option, this social class is supported by stating the centurion's authority over his troops: 'For I am a man who is himself under authority and has under myself troops, go forth and so shall he.' Jerome's version states: 'Behold, since I am a man, go forth and so shall he.' The *cum*-clause emphasises the centurion's humanity in the face of Christ but does away with the explanation of his hierarchy of authority. It is, nonetheless, a logically constructed translation and I see no reason to believe it was purpose-built for this section.

***Matthew 8:14 febrientem v. febricitantem***

Cum uenisset Iesus in domum Petri, uidit socrum eius iacentem et <b>febrientem</b> <sup>1</sup> , et tetigit manum eius, et dimisit eam febris, et surrexit et ministrabat eis.	Et cum uenisset Iesus in domum Petri, uidit socrum eius iacentem et <b>febricitantem</b> <sup>1</sup> , et tetigit manum eius et dimisit eam febris, et surrexit et ministrabat eis.
<sup>1</sup> : unique	<sup>1</sup> : <i>cet.</i>

The difference that arises from the *CM*'s *febrientem* and the *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate *febricitantem* (*a b F A* all agree) for the Greek *πυρέσσουσιν* is admittedly small. The root of each participle is different in the minutest sense as both convey the same essential meaning (*febrío* v. *febricito*, to be ill with a fever). The reason for pointing out the discrepancy in this instance lies in the fact that Jerome's near contemporary Peter Chrysologus (380-450) chose the *CM*'s *febrientem* in his *Serm.* 18. The connection between a potential innovation of Jerome's and a contemporaneously working Italian Father is appealing, but I admit tenuous on the basis of this single word. Regardless, it stands again to mention that Jerome chose a word not found in either the *Vetus Latina* or the Vulgate tradition.



As in our last example (8:7) Jerome's *febrientem* is, as far as I can reasonably ascertain, unique when set along our MSS. In fact, in a rare instance for Jülicher's *Itala*, the totality of 8:14 (save for one missing *et* in *k*) is recorded as identical across all traditions. That is to say, there is not a clearly identifiable example – in my table (chapter 7, table 1) or Jülicher's consensus – which demonstrates a precedent for alteration. The equivalence in Chrysologus may serve as evidence of its usage beyond mere typographical error. Furthermore, Jerome must have been acquainted with the historical usage in *febricitantem* and was either using a text otherwise unknown to us, or had himself altered the traditional translation of *πυρέσσουσιν*.

### ***Matthew 8:20 Nidos v. Tabernacula***

Et dicit ei Iesus: Uulpes foueas habent et uolucres caeli <b>nidos</b> . Filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet.	Et dicit ei Iesus: Uulpes foveas habent et uolucres caeli <b>tabernacula</b> , Filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet.
---	---

This section records another lexical dissimilarity in which the expected result, that is Jerome's *CM* agreeing with established *Vetus Latina* MSS against the Vulgate tradition, is found. This particularly discrepancy rests in the treatment of the Greek *κατασκηνώσεις*, classically translated 'encampments' and here referring to the dwellings of birds. The rendering found in the *CM* of *nidos* 'nests' translates the intended meaning of the word if not its literal meaning. On the other hand, the Vulgate seeks to more directly render the sense of sheltering with the term *tabernacula*. The two choices, while both essentially conveying the resting place of the birds in Jesus's parable, indicate variable opinions on the intention of the word.

Milne's work on Augustine demonstrates a third possibility for *Matthew* 8:20 not shown in the *CM* or Vulgate traditions, and seldom in the *Vetus Latina*. He cites

Augustine's *caeli diuersoria* (*Contra Faustum* 22.48) and its similarity to *caeli deuorsoria* in African *k*.

The *CM* finds parallels in Jerome's Rome period *Ep.* 22.21, indicating a preference for *nidos* throughout his career and during his supposed evangelical editorial period. Early *Vetus Latina* MSS *a, b* also show a preference for *nidos* in *Matthew* 8:20. Some of our best and earliest Vulgate MSS record *tabernacula* (*ZFD*, *S* is missing this section). Vulgate *Luke* 9:58 is identical to Vulgate *Matthew* 8:20, save for its demonstration of *nidos*, and provides an illustrative example of further Vulgate treatment of this form.<sup>15</sup> *a* uses *nidos*, likely under the influence of Vulgate *Luke* and the *Vetus Latina* tradition. I agree with both the Oxford and Stuttgart editions that the early usage of the new *tabernacula* must have been a unique decision of the Vulgate's editor. It must be concluded that the Vulgate *Matthew tabernacula* is an innovation and apparently one with which Jerome was not familiar.

### ***Matthew 10:5 Ambulaueritis v. Abieritis***

In uiam gentium ne <b>ambulaueritis</b> et in	In uiam gentium ne <b>abieritis</b> et in ciuitates
ciuitates Samaritanorum ne intraueritis, sed	Samaritanorum ne intraueritis, sed potius ite
potius ite ad oues quae perierunt domus Israhel.	ad oues quae perierunt domus Israhel.

The *CM* suggests a curious Latin rendering for the Greek μή ἀπέλθῃτε found during Christ's exhortation to not go out to the Gentiles nor the Samaritans, but to the 'lost sheep of Israel' in what is known as the 'Little Commission.' The Vulgate renders the Greek into Latin as *ne abieritis* matching the Greek 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural, aorist, subjunctive with Latin 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural, perfect, subjunctive. The meanings of the words are lexically approximate compounds to indicate a 'going out': *ab* + *eo* and ἀπό +

<sup>15</sup> et ait illi Iesus vulpes foveas habent et volucres caeli nidos Filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet. Vulgate *Luke* 9:58

ἔρχομαι. Thus, the choice found in the *CM* to state that the apostles should not 'walk' to the Gentiles strikes as purposefully different than the Vulgate choice.

This particular lexical difference is unique in that Jerome differs from both the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* traditions. *Abieritis* is itself not unique to the Vulgate. We are able to find clear precedent from our oldest *Vetus Latina* MSS *a b d*. In fact, Jülicher lists the choice *abieritis* as consistent throughout all of his Italian MSS (listing African *k* as *nec ieritis*).

The choice of *ambulaueritis* as found in the *CM* is made even more striking when we consider that Jerome was apparently aware of *Vetus Latina* tradition to translate μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε as *ne abieritis*. In the late 370's in his *Ep.* 21.3, a letter to Damasus detailing the difficulties he would face in editing the Gospels, Jerome cites Matt. 10:5 as *ne abieritis*. Thus, in a letter to his patron about *Vetus Latina* manuscripts written some time before he began his early 380's efforts on the Gospels, Jerome records this reading. As in the *Vetus Latina* tradition, *abieritis* remains in the most important Vulgate MSS. Jerome must have changed his perspective within the two intervening decades leading to the *CM*, and no evidence can be found of his continued usage of *abieritis* since he began his revision. An answer to why this may be could only be based upon speculation. If I am permitted to indulge this speculation, I would suggest that *ambulaueritis* could potentially represent the fruit of Jerome's true early 380's Gospel revision as presented to Damasus. What can be asserted confidently, however, is that he diverted from the *Vetus Latina* precedent inherited by the Vulgate and landed squarely on a counter-Vulgate choice.

*Matthew 10:10 in manu*

Nolite possidere aurum neque argentum neque pecuniam in zonis uestris, <b>non</b> peram in uia, <b>non</b> duas tunicas, <b>non</b> calciamenta, <b>neque</b> uirgam <b>in manu</b> ; dignus <b>est enim</b> operarius cibo suo.	Nolite possidere aurum neque argentum neque pecuniam in zonis uestris, <b>non</b> peram in uia, <b>neque</b> duas tunicas, <b>neque</b> calciamenta, <b>neque</b> uirgam; dignus <b>enim est</b> operarius cibo suo.
--	--

This verse includes quite a few stylistic curiosities when placed in view of the Vulgate preferences. Before we touch upon the unique inclusion of the *CM*'s *in manu* after *neque uirgam*, it is important to touch upon the differences found in the rendering of the negative conjunctions. The Greek suggests **μὴ** πῆραν εἰς ὁδόν, **μηδὲ** δύο χιτῶνας, **μηδὲ** ὑποδήματα, **μηδὲ** ῥάβδον. The words in bold can be matched rather directly to the Vulgate example: **μὴ** = *non*, 3x **μηδὲ**= 3x *neque*. The *CM* is looser with its rendering of the Greek conjunctions, choosing *non* for the first **μὴ**, but also for the next two **μηδὲ**, choosing *neque* only for the last. The difference is striking when compared to the Stuttgart's attempt to maintain the text *per cola et commata* which has each consecutive *neque* phrase in the form of a list. It is certainly strange in light of this otherwise neat option that Jerome's *CM* should have chosen a rather freer solution in rendering the Greek.

The final difference in bold, that is *est enim* v. *enim est* is relatively less significant. However, Augustine does seemingly use Jerome's *est enim* in *Contra Adim.* 20 and *De opere monach.* 7.8, as cited by Milne who notes the dissimilarity with the Vulgate in the case of *est enim*.<sup>16</sup> Despite the fact that there is a precedent, the

---

<sup>16</sup> Milne (1926) 30.

difference here is so small and easily understood as simple inversion so as not to warrant much further investigation.

The section becomes even further divorced from the Vulgate, and in fact the *Vetus Latina* and Greek original in the case of its addition of *in manu*. Surely, the sense of the line μηδὲ ῥάβδον implies 'nor a staff in your hand,' but the further explication of *in manu* seems unique to Jerome. The addition must be in the copy available to Jerome, as its inclusion for clarity seems wholly unnecessary. Such an inclusion must be indicative of the unique edition Jerome to which Jerome had access for the *CM*. However, it cannot be argued to be a Vulgate addition to *Matthew* 10:10.

#### ***Matthew 14:6 triclino***

Die autem natalis Herodis saltait filia	Die autem natalis Herodis saltait filia
Herodiadis in medio <b>triclino</b> , et placuit Herodi	Herodiadis in medio et placuit Herodi.

In this instance, Jerome carries a popular *Vetus Latina* usage into his work. This is notable as its omission is a consistent choice in Vulgate texts of *Matthew*, and rare in *Vetus Latina* examples. The omission occurs in *aur d l*, while *a b c f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h q* all demonstrate its inclusion. The Stuttgart Vulgate demonstrates its exclusion in each of its examples, suggesting that the edition was consistently adopted and must have been copied through from an early iteration of the tradition.

Further evidence from Jerome is lacking. Biblindex provides a number of Ambrose paraphrases of the verse, which, as in the case of *Explanatio super psalmos XII* 35.13 and *De Nabuthae* 5.20, do not include *triclino*. It should be noted that both Ambrosian works are close contemporaries to the *CM*.

**Matthew 15:6**Et non **honorauit** patrem suum aut matrem.Et non **honorificabit** patrem suum aut matrem.

Here two different traditions are demonstrated in the *CM* and the Vulgate in the verbs *honorauit* and *honorificabit*. First, the root verbs are slightly different, with the *CM* opting for the pure *honore* and the Vulgate choosing the causative affix *honor-i-ficare*. The result is nuanced with Jerome's version meaning 'to honour' and the Vulgate's 'to do or cause honour to.' Secondly, the two examples choose different tenses: perfect in the *CM* and future in the Vulgate.

Our table (chapter 7, table 1) points to a *Vetus Latina* origin for the Vulgate form. In fact, Jülicher demonstrates that, regardless of tense, the root *honorifica-* was by far the most popular *Vetus Latina* choice, appearing in nine of his twelve manuscripts. One must turn to our listed *d* as well as *ff<sup>d</sup>* and African *e* to find Jerome's root *honora-*. As for tenses, Jülicher chooses the future *honorificabit* as his consensus form, despite having only two *Vetus Latina* examples (*g<sup>d</sup> q*) for the tense. Otherwise, his other ten examples are perfect tenses, as found in the *CM*.

Jerome uses the passage in *Ep.* 121.10 in which he also prefers the perfect tense, albeit with the causative root as found in most examples and the Vulgate. Thus, Jerome demonstrates familiarity with both roots but no familiarity with the Vulgate's unique future tense.

**Matthew 15:11 Communicat v. Coinquinat**Non quod intrat in os **communicat**(1) hominem, sed quod procedit ex ore, hoc **communicat**(2) hominem.Non quod intrat in os **coinquinat**(1) hominem, sed quod procedit ex ore, hoc **coinquinat**(2) hominem.*communicat* (1) *d*, (2) *c d*

Jerome records a near direct copy of the Vulgate *Matt.* 15:11 with the important exception of its translation of the main verb to convey the concept of defilement in relation to eating and drinking things considered ritually unclean. Jerome's Latin text for the *CM* chooses to render the Greek κοινοῖ as *communicat* whereas the Vulgate tradition expects the more vivid *coinquinat*. The importance of this departure from the Vulgate is emphasized by the argument that follows, in which Jerome discusses the usage of *communicare* rather than the usage of *coinquinare*.

In the commentary following the lemma, Jerome acknowledges that the word *communicare* in this sense is uniquely scriptural and not part of the common vernacular, and thus requires further explanation. What follows is thus an explanation of this strange usage of the word and its relationship to Jewish dietary restrictions. Jerome's preference for literalism can account for his preference, as he writes, for *communicat* to stress that 'The Jewish People... call the food which all (other) men consume common.' Through an invocation of *Acts* 10:15 '*quod deus sanctificavit tu ne commune dixeris*,' he defends the concept of commonality over uncleanness to emphasize the superiority of the *parte dei* over the concept of ritual purity. Curiously, the Vulgate form then follows in Jerome's discussion of the verse, demonstrating that Jerome was familiar with the usage of *coinquinat*. However, *coinquinat* stresses the innate and natural impurity of the object for Jerome, and not the fact that all food is by itself pure unless it should be sacrificed to idols (as otherwise suggested by his *communicat* here). Furthermore, from a strict sense of lexical parallelism, *communicat* serves as a much more direct treatment of κοινοῖ than the direct concept of defilement found in *coinquinat*.

This section is especially important to understand Jerome's text of *Matthew* when composing his *CM*. Where small lexical differences may be permitted by counting them among a group of transcriptional errors through the centuries, this particular section of commentary shows Jerome making a specific argument against the rendering

found in the Vulgate tradition (and a number of *VL* MSS)– a rendering recognized by Jerome. The *CM* specifically argues in favor of a non-Vulgate reading while still mentioning the Vulgate rendering. Such an argument is assuredly illogical if we presuppose that the Vulgate author was Jerome who then argued against his choice a mere fifteen or so years later.

*Communicat* for κοινοῖ is not original to the *CM* and can be traced along with *(co)inquinat* to *Vetus Latina* manuscripts. Even within the Vulgate *Matthew* both forms can be found to render κοινοῖ. In fact, the same translation is found in the Gospel of Mark 7:20 and 7:23 in a parallel story.<sup>17</sup> As for various *Vetus Latina* treatments of this particular κοινοῖ at *Matthew* 15:11 the only consistency found in their ambivalence for either form. Our two oldest Italian MSS, *Vercellensis* and *Veronensis*, agree with the Vulgate in *inquinat* (lacking the compound in *co-*). However, other ‘early’ *Vetus Latina* sources such as *Bezae* agree with Jerome’s rendering in *communicat*. Outside the Gospel evidence, Vulgate Romans 14:14 renders κοινοῖν as *commune* all three times it is used in that passage.

Contemporary Latin Patristic sources give evidence of both forms as well. Augustine’s *Contra Faustum* 16.31 sides with Jerome and cites 15:11 with *communicat*. However, further Augustinian examples demonstrate that the Bishop was ambivalent in his citations. In the very same work a few lines above, Augustine chooses *polueret* (*Contra Faustum* 16.6). Even stranger, he cites *coinquinat* in *Contra Faustum* 6.6 and 32.13. In that same work, Augustine shows three different usages. Augustine thrice uses the Vulgate *coinquinat* in *De moribus eccl. Cath* 1.71, *De mor. Mani.* 2.31, *Contra Adimantum* 15. Furthermore, Ambrose records the Vulgate form *coinquinat* both before and after Jerome’s time in Rome in the early 380’s, together with its Vulgate prefix *co-*,

---

<sup>17</sup> The inconsistencies of Vulgate lexical choices across Gospels will be further discussed below in the case of *supersubstantialem* (*Matt.* 6:11) and *cottidianum* (*Luke* 11:3).



in his *De paradiso* 9.42 (ca. 375-8), *De Cain et Abel* 1.10 (ca. 375-378), and *Expositio de Psalmo CXVIII* 10.46 (ca. 386-90).

It is clear from his commentary on the section that Jerome knew of both renderings and in fact preferred *communicat* to the Vulgate *coinquinat*. This implicit argument against the Vulgate's choice and in favour of an arguably more direct rendering of the Greek κοινοῖ is at the very least indication of a divergence between the Vulgate author and Jerome. The general conclusion of the above textual evidence is that there was disagreement between the literal meaning of communality and the interpretive sense of pollution. This sort of disagreement among even the Vulgate text as a whole is not unprecedented (see *Matthew* 6:11 above) but demonstrates nonetheless the disparity between the demonstrably different translational choices in the *CM* and the Vulgate.

***Matthew 15:24 perditas v. quae perierunt***

Non sum missus nisi ad oues, <b>perditas</b> domus Israhel.	Non sum missus nisi ad oues, <b>quae perierunt</b> domus Israhel.
--	--

Jerome's *CM* in *perditas* chooses a participle ('the lost') for the verbal phrase *quae perierunt* ('those who are lost'). The difference here is significant as Jerome is consistent throughout his work in his usage of this participle where otherwise the Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* agree on a clear precedent in the verbal phrase. Jerome uses *perditas* as such in his *Ep.* 121.5 and evidently preferred this unique reading. *Quae perierunt* is found in *a* [-rant] *b d* and is used as Jülicher's consensus form with variation in *perditas* noted in *ff<sup>d</sup> q*. Milne's work on Augustine indicates that Augustine (*In Rom.* 82), like Jerome, preferred *perditas* and Milne listed this as a curiosity against African *e k*.<sup>18</sup> I deduce, therefore, that there was some common source for both Augustine and Jerome's choice that is not so easily identifiable today due to some

<sup>18</sup> Milne (1926) p. 46.

degree of rarity when set against the rest of the *Vetus Latina* traditions; although, it is tempting but difficult to assert that the translation was unique to either Augustine or Jerome. However, Jerome's consistent usage of this option in 15:24 is especially notable as it is not to be seen in the Vulgate tradition. Thus, Jerome cannot be said to be a witness to the clear Vulgate tradition *quae perierunt* carried directly from the preponderance of *Vetus Latina* MSS.

Jerome carried this usage until the end of his life. His very late *Comm. in Hierem.*, discussed above for *Matthew* 3:9, indicates that Jerome maintained this *perditas* usage until his final days. As indicated by table 3 found in chapter 7 on the *Commentary on Jeremiah*, Jerome writes at 6.26, 'non **ueni** nisi ad oues **perditas** domus *Israhel*.' As such, we can say with certainty that Jerome used this non-Vulgate reading throughout his career.

### **Matthew 19:14**

**Dimittite** paruulos et nolite eos prohibere ad me uenire; talium est enim regnum caelorum.

**Sinite** paruulos et nolite eos prohibere ad me uenire; talium est enim regnum caelorum.

The words in bold demonstrate an interesting variation between not only Jerome and the Vulgate, but also Jerome and *Vetus Latina* tradition as a whole. I have found only *d* to agree with Jerome's text's *dimittite*, and Jülicher for his part lists *sinite* as his historical form and also only finds *dimittite* in *d*. Jerome's usage here must either be his own innovation, or due to some other *Vetus Latina* tradition (i.e. *d*).

Further contemporary Patristic evidence points toward Vulgate/*Vetus Latina* *sinite*. Ambrose uses *sinite* in *Explanatio Psalmi* 36.52 and *Exposito euangelii Lucae* 8.57.

The Greek in question is ἄφετε τὰ παῖδια, which means 'let the children go/come.' The word ἄφετε has a certain sense of dismissal, loosening of bonds, and

movement. The *LSJ* confirms the sense of 'letting go' or 'leaving' as in ἀπεῖναι τοῖσι βαρβάροις 'leaving it to the barbarians' (Herodotus *Histories* 9.106). Thus, Jerome's choice of *dimittite* ('allow them to go!'; 'may they be dismissed!') is appropriate and captures the sense appropriately translated (from the Greek ἄφετε) in the NRSV as 'let the little children come to me.' On the other hand, the Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* choice produces an odd variant in *sinite*, 'suffer' or 'allow.' The lack of complementary verb (*i.e.* *uenire*) produces the archaic sort of rendering produced by the *KJV* as 'suffer little children.' Jerome's choice in *dimittite* is not only a higher level of Latinity, but suggests a close acquaintance with the Greek meaning. This single lexical difference is indicative of Jerome's own edition and his attention to accuracy.

It is difficult to presume that Jerome was working with a copy in the tradition of *d* given the amount of times *d* and *CM* have demonstrable dissimilarities. Jerome's choice may be sourced from another *Vetus Latina* source or may be indicative of the true translation he made in the early 380's in Rome. There is very little precedent for the term, except for perhaps his closer eye on the Greek editions he collected, as surmised above.

### ***Matthew 19:24-26***

Et iterum dico uobis: Facilius est camelum per foramen acus transire quam diuitem intrare in **regna** caelorum.

**quis ergo saluus fiet?**

(Quae) **apud homines (impossibilia) apud deum** **possibilia sunt.**

Et iterum dico uobis: Facilius est camelum per foramen acus transire quam diuitem intrare in **regnum** caelorum.

**quis ergo poterit saluus esse? (F)**

Aspiciens autem Iesus dixit illis **apud homines hoc impossibile est apud Deum autem omnia** **possibilia sunt. (F)**

This verse appears in the *CM* in a characteristically different fashion than the expected Vulgate. Extracts from the three verses are discussed in succession as *Et*

*iterum dico uobis: Facilius est camelum per foramen acus transire quam diuitem intrare in regna caelorum, quis ergo saluus fiet, and quae apud homines impossibilia apud deum possibilia sunt.* The treatment of the final section found in *Matthew* 19:26 is noticeably different from Vulgate *apud homines hoc impossibile est apud Deum autem omnia possibilia sunt*, but I accept that this may be due to flattening and shortening. The first section presents a neuter plural accusative *regna* for τὴν Βασιλείαν where the Vulgate more directly renders the neuter singular accusative in *regnum*. While the difference finds precedent in Jerome's other writings (*Ep.* 120.1, *In Hier.* 6.28.23) so too can *regnum* be found (*Ep.* 79.3).

The more significant issue at play in this section is the treatment of *Matthew* 19:25 τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι. Jerome's choice in *quis ergo saluus fiet* is rather different than the Vulgate *quis ergo poterit saluus esse*. The *CM* suggests a sense of 'therefore who will be made safe?' while the Vulgate more directly renders δύναται as 'therefore who will be able to be saved?' The distinction is not significantly different to impose theological difference but certainly marks a difference in the treatment of a Greek verb. The sense of ability with a complementary infinitive is more directly rendered in the Vulgate. However, Jerome's *CM* perhaps sought to more directly convey the passive nature 'who will be made able to' in using *fiet*. I do not in any case see how someone familiar with the Vulgate could have chosen such a different method to arrive at a similar meaning. In fact, the manuscript evidence suggests that the Vulgate offering was found in *VL* texts such as *a b* and thus the innovative translation is the one found in the *CM*. I can find no precedent before Jerome for this rendering and must consider it his own.

Interestingly, Jerome demonstrates a similar translation in his *Comm. in Hierem.* 6.28, but with one notable difference. Here too the *regna* is used. However, in this late commentary Jerome changes *est...transire* to a simple *intrabit*. I have found no *Vetus*

*Latina* precedent for this choice and must believe it was either original or from an otherwise unknown source.

***Matthew 21:9 Excelsis v. Altissimis***

Turbae autem quae praecedebant et quae sequebantur clamabant dicentes: osanna Filio Dauid, benedictus qui uenturus est in nomine Domini, osanna in <b>excelsis</b> . <sup>19</sup>	Turbae autem quae praecedebant et quae sequebantur clamabant dicentes: osanna Filio David, benedictus qui uenturus est in nomine Domini osanna in <b>altissimis</b> .
---	--

The Greek ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις has found itself translated as *in excelsis* throughout the history of the Latin liturgy in the *Gloria* or *Greater Doxology* through to our present day.<sup>20</sup> Jerome's *CM* agrees with the historical precedent found throughout the ancient liturgy and *Vetus Latina* MSS. The Vulgate *Matthew*'s traditional rendering of *in altissimis* is a peculiar deviation from the norm in Matthean Latin translation, especially when considering it was not adopted in the order of the Tridentine Mass along with the adoption of the Vulgate tradition. This discussion is focused on the usage of *in excelsis* for *Matthew* 21:9, and not the similar passage in *Luke* 2:14 for which Jerome (*Ep.* 121.10) and the Vulgate tradition alike prefer *in altissimis*. Jerome's career-long usage of the *VL in excelsis* for his Matthean usage but not his Lukan text suggests that his text of *Matthew* was not the originator of the translation found in Vulgate *Matthew*.

The preference for *in excelsis* both in liturgical history and in Jerome may be explained by the parallel treatment found in Vulgate *Psalms* 148. The LXX demonstrates

<sup>19</sup> Jerome exhibits a text using *in excelsis* for *Matthew* 21:9 in all his citations: *Tractatus in Marci euangelium* 7.69; 7.76; *in die dominica Paschae* 2.68; *Ep.* 22.41

<sup>20</sup> The most recent confirmation of this ancient translation can be found in the current *Mass of the 1970 Missal*.

ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις for בְּמַרוֹמִים as found in the Gospel reference, and similarly the Vulgate *Psalms* uses *in excelsis* in its rendering. The Vulgate *Matthew* choice further divorces the text from the Vulgate editor of the *Psalms*. Further discussion of references to the Vulgate *Psalms* will be discussed below in the subsequent subsection on *Matthew* 27:46.

Within Jerome's earlier work is a demonstrable history of preference for the well-established term as seen in *Ep.* 22.41, *Tractatus in Marci euang.* 7.69 and 7.76, and in *die dominica Paschae* 2.68. A corollary statement may be made: there is no evidence that Jerome was familiar with the translation *altissimis* for τοῖς ὑψίστοις in his text of *Matthew* (the same, however, cannot be said of his text of *Luke* 2:14).

#### ***Matthew 21:40 Colonis v. Agricolis***

Cum ergo uenerit dominus uineae quid faciet  
**colonis** illis.

Cum ergo uenerit dominus uineae quid faciet  
**agricolis** illis.

In this instance, a singular lexical difference to treat τοῖς γεωργοῖς is present. The *CM* inherits the established *Vetus Latina* preference for *col(l)onis* which appears in the Vulgate as *agricolis*.<sup>21</sup> In this instance, it seems that it is the *Vetus Latina* and *CM* choice in *colonis* which establishes the characters as tenant-farmers more than *agricolis*. Regardless, Vulgate *Matthew* chose to break from this tradition and chose *agricolis* whereas a parallel parable found in Vulgate *Luke* 9:20 maintains the usage of *colonis*. *Vetus Latina* examples, as demonstrated by table 1 (chapter 7), prefer Jerome's choice in the *CM*, and Jülicher indicates the novelty of *agricolis* in *aur f g<sup>1</sup> l*. As the novel change seems to be one for which Jerome was not aware, I do not see evidence that

<sup>21</sup> Save for *F* where we find *colonis*, likely under the influence *Luke* 20:9, which in the Vulgate uses *colonis*.

Jerome was associated with this Vulgate reading in this instance. Rather, Jerome echoes *colonis* in agreement with the earliest *Vetus Latina* examples available.

### **Matthew 22:5-6**

Et abierunt alius in uillam suam alius ad negotiationem, <b>alii</b> uero tenuerunt seruos eius et contumelia adfectos occiderunt.	Et abierunt alius in uillam suam alius <b>uero</b> ad negotiationem <b>suam</b> , <b>reliqui</b> uero tenuerunt seruos eius et contumelia adfectos occiderunt.
--	--

This instance shows minor alterations, albeit some which are unexpected when cast against the other Latin families of translations. The omission of the initial *uero* as found in the *CM* is the only difference for which I can find some precedent. Table 1(found in chapter 7) lists only *d* as exhibiting this variation, whereas Jülicher adds the rather late (8th Century or later) *aur* and *ff*<sup>1</sup>. However, I can find no example in Latin MSS for the omission of *suam*. The replacement of *reliqui*, a rather solid *Vetus Latina* choice, with *alii* finds no direct correlation. I can however echo Jülicher's finding that *ff*<sup>1</sup> *h* use *ceteri* in this location. The significance of this difference taken alone is slight; when taken along with the overall picture presented in this chapter, these small variations speak to a different text at the hands of Jerome. I say this as I find it wholly unlikely that Jerome would make such a small change extemporaneously while dictating his commentary given his faithful rendering of identifiable strains throughout this text.

### **Matthew 22:34**

Pharisaei <b>audito</b> quod silentium inposuisset Sadducaeis conuenerunt in unum	Pharisaei <b>autem audientes</b> quod silentium inposuisset Sadducaeis conuenerunt in unum
--	---

Jerome's choice here presents a rather difficult situation to justify. The plural present participle *audientes* clearly referring to the Pharisees in the Vulgate is instead here a singular perfect participle *audito*. The singular number means that it cannot adjectivally agree with the plural *Pharisaei*. I have not found a single example to justify

Jerome's choice. In fact, Jülicher cites no variations whatsoever in his consensus, save for his African *k* that omits *autem* but changes the verb to a finite with a different root: *cum uidissent*. Jerome's choice must be meant as an ablative absolute for which he is collectivizing the Pharisees, akin to 'The Pharisees, having heard ...' The choice is nonetheless clunky and certainly unique as regards the available Latin MSS.

### ***Matthew 23:35 qui occisus est v. quem occidistis***

Ut ueniat super uos omnis sanguis iustus qui effusus est super terram a sanguine Abel iusti usque ad sanguinem Zachariae filii Barachiae **qui occisus est** inter templum et altare.

Ut ueniat super uos omnis sanguis iustus qui effusus est super terram a sanguine Abel iusti usque ad sanguinem Zacchariae filii Barachiae **quem occidistis** inter templum et altare.

This difference shifts the verb from the active perfect indicative (Vulgate and all *Vetus Latina*) 'whom you killed' to the passive perfect indicative (*CM*) 'who was killed,' without explicit actor. Thus, Jerome's text of *Matthew* has made a significant and potentially unique editorial decision in translating ὃν ἐφονεύσατε as a passive where the Greek clearly suggests an active (aorist) perfect with the accusative pronoun *quem*. Thus, not only is the *CM* not in accord with the Vulgate, it seems to be itself in line with some unique translation.

### ***Matthew 24:1-2***

Et egressus Iesus de templo ibat. Et accesserunt **ad eum**<sup>1</sup> discipuli eius ut ostenderent ei **aedificia**<sup>2</sup> templi. Ipse autem respondens dixit **illis**<sup>3</sup>: uidetis haec omnia? Amen dico uobis: non relinquetur hic lapis super lapidem qui non destruat.

Et egressus Iesus de templo ibat. Et accesserunt discipuli eius ut ostenderent ei **aedificationes**<sup>1</sup> templi. Ipse autem respondens dixit **eis**<sup>2</sup>: uidetis haec omnia? Amen dico vobis: non relinquetur hic lapis super lapidem qui non destruat.

<sup>1</sup>: *c f*

<sup>2</sup>: *f*

<sup>3</sup>: *Jülicher*

<sup>1</sup>: *aur*

<sup>2</sup>: *aur d f l g*



It should be clear from the above table that Jerome follows a rather different tradition from the type inherited by the Vulgate. Aside from the rather minor difference *illis/eis* (indicated by the left column fn. 3, right fn. 2), for which Jerome follows a clear *Vetus Latina* precedent, Jerome's text is strikingly similar to *f*. His practically unique addition of *ad eum* stands against the large body of Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* evidence. His *aedificia* can only be found in *f*, whereas the Vulgate choice *aedificationes* can be found in *aur* (-em) *ff*<sup>1</sup> *g*<sup>1</sup> *l*. The *CM*'s unique choices do not bear witness to Hieronymian acknowledgement of the Vulgate form. Furthermore, they suggest a unique tact on the part of Jerome that may be evidence of his original translation or preference for a choice such as that found in *f*.

### **Matthew 24:7-8**

<p><b>Surget</b><sup>1</sup> enim gens <b>contra</b><sup>2</sup> gentem et regnum <b>contra</b><sup>3</sup> regnum, et erunt pestilentiae et fames et terrae motus per loca; haec {}<sup>4</sup> omnia initia sunt dolorum.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>h</i> (insurget, <i>Jülicher</i>)  <sup>2</sup>: <i>Jülicher</i>  <sup>3</sup>: <i>Jülicher</i>  <sup>4</sup>: unique omission in this order. ~omnia haec <i>Jülicher</i></p>	<p><b>Consurget</b><sup>1</sup> enim gens <b>in</b><sup>2</sup> gentem et regnum <b>in</b><sup>3</sup> regnum, et erunt pestilentiae et fames et terrae motus per loca; haec <b>autem</b><sup>4</sup> omnia initia sunt dolorum</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>aur ff</i><sup>1</sup> <i>g</i><sup>1</sup>; (-ent) <i>l</i>  <sup>2</sup>: <i>aur ff</i><sup>1</sup> <i>g</i><sup>1</sup> <i>l</i>  <sup>3</sup>: <i>aur ff</i><sup>1</sup> <i>g</i><sup>1</sup> <i>l</i>  <sup>4</sup>: <i>aur c f ff</i><sup>1</sup> <i>ff</i><sup>2</sup> <i>g</i><sup>1</sup> <i>l</i></p>
---	---

The *CM* is strictly *Vetus Latina* in these two verses. The *CM*'s *surget* differs from the clear Vulgate (and *aur ff*<sup>1</sup> *g*<sup>1</sup>; (-ent) *l*) by leaving off the prefix *con-*; however, *Jülicher* suggests that the prefix *in-* was common *Vetus Latina*, and thus Jerome's prefix-less choice is echoed only in *h*. Jerome's preference for *contra* twice over *in* further breaks from a clear *Vetus Latina* trend. Finally, Jerome's *haec omnia* with omission of the *autem* is a seemingly unique creation. Besides this unique yet rather insignificant omission, Jerome's text of 24:7-8 is characteristically *Vetus Latina*.

**Matthew 26:46**

Surgite eamus; ecce adpropinquavit qui me <b>traditurus est.</b> <sup>1</sup>	Surgite eamus; ecce adpropinquavit qui me <b>tradit.</b>
--	---

<sup>1</sup>: unique

Jerome's choice of the active future participle in periphrastic construction can be translated as '(who) is going to betray (me)'. Contrasted with the clear *Vetus Latina* preference for the future active indicative *tradet* '(who) will betray (me)' and the Vulgate active present indicative *tradit*, '(who) betrays (me),' Jerome's periphrastic choice is unique. Yet, it is not altogether surprising. Below, in our section discussing sections in which Jerome is potentially a witness for Vulgate readings, 17:22 is explored. Specifically, 17:22 previews Christ's coming betrayal as 'the Son of Man *tradendus est*, will be betrayed,' here using the passive voice in reference to his third-person self-reference. In 26:46, Christ's prediction is in effect and is directly tied in Jerome's version to the earlier periphrastic of the prediction. As will be reiterated below, this neat connection must be purposeful; however, the double usage of the periphrastic in 17:22 and 26:46 is unique to Jerome's text of *Matthew* as seen in the *CM*.

Furthermore, the future tense preferred by Jerome is in keeping with all *VL* forms as per Jülicher. It is the Vulgate tradition that renders the verb in the present tense. The Vulgate choice in present tense (*qui me tradit*) matches the present tense found in the Greek ὁ παραδιδούς με, whereas Jerome's participle matches the participle παραδιδούς in the Greek original. Jerome's text of *Matthew* chooses the participle construction while using the Latin future, perhaps to maintain some of the force of the

immediacy of Christ's betrayal. Regardless, Jerome's text of *Matthew* 26:46 is demonstrably unique in the *CM*.

### ***Matthew 27:46***

Et circa horam nonam clamavit Iesus uoce magna dicens: heli heli lema sabacthani, hoc est: Deus meus, Deus meus, **quare<sup>1</sup> me dereliquisti?**

<sup>1</sup>: unique

Et circa horam nonam clamavit Iesus uoce magna dicens: Heli Heli lema sabacthani, hoc est: Deus meus, Deus meus, **ut quid dereliquisti me?**

In this section Jerome discusses the connection between Psalm 21 and Jesus's ninth hour lament on the cross as found at *Matthew* 27:46 as '*Deus meus, Deus meus, quare me dereliquisti?*' The Vulgate's difference '*ut quid dereliquisti me*' is on face value a similar method to express the same interrogative sense of Christ's plaintive cry. However, Jerome's comment that Christ 'has used the beginning of the twenty-first Psalm,' demonstrates the scholar's knowledge of the precedent text beyond the Greek transliteration of the lament while writing his commentary. When both the Hebrew and LXX text of Psalm 21 are analyzed it is evident that the text in the *CM* demonstrates greater Hebrew accuracy, and the Vulgate text a greater preference for the LXX.

The reading in the Vulgate with *ut quid* has clear precedent in the eldest *Vetus Latina* texts. *Vetus Latina a b d* each use the expected Vulgate *ut quid*. Tertullian provides early Third Century Latin patristic evidence in *Adversus Praxean* 25.2 (*ad quid me dereliquisti*) and 30.1 (*ut quid me dereliquisti*). So too does Augustine in his late *De Trin.* 4.6 use *ut quid me dereliquisti*.

Despite the early Patristic and *Vetus Latina* MSS evidence for *ut quid*, later Patristic evidence contemporaneous with Jerome demonstrates usage of *quare*. Hilary of Poitiers prefers *quare* in his *Comm. in Evan. Matthaei* 33.6 (c. 353-356); *de Trinitate*

1.31, 1.32, 6.25, 10.9, 10.31, 10.49, 10.51, 10.60, 10.71 (c. 356-360); *Tractatus in Psalmum LXVIII* 2 (c. 360-367). Similarly, Ambrose uses *quare* in *de Fide ad Gratianum* 1.14.92 and 2.7.56 (c. 377-380); *Explanatio Psalmi* 39.16 and 43.32 (c. 374-397); *Explanatio Symboli ad Initiandos* 4 (c. 374-397); *Expositio Evang. Secund. Lucam* 10.107, 10.113, 10.127, and 10.129 (c. 377-389); *Expositio de Psalmo CXVIII* 1.19 (c. 386-390).

Jerome used this passage as evidence for Christ's preference for the Hebrew Scriptures instead of the Seventy in his *Adversus Libros Rufini* 2.34. In highlighting the New Testament lament's preservation of *Heli*, *Heli lama sabachtani* and parallel Latin *Deus meus*, *Deus meus*, he argues for the superiority of the Hebrew source over the derivative LXX. 'I say this not to assail the translators of the Seventy ... but wherever they disagreed they put in Greek what was said in the Hebrew.'<sup>22</sup> In this section, Jerome notes the danger in simply copying the LXX, which he notes spuriously adds *πρόσχες μοι* whereas the Hebrew has no such equivalent. Here, Jerome uses *Matthew* and Psalm 21:2 in parallel and suggests that the proper translation is found in *quare*. This landmark difference used in defense of the purity of original source translation further emphasizes the detachment of Hieronymian authorship from the choices found in the Vulgate.

The later trend of *quare* is the closest to the Psalm source material. The Hebrew text of Vulgate Psalm 21:2 is *אֱלִי אֱלִי לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי*, transliterated as *Heli, Heli, lama sabachtani*, is treated as *O Θεός, ὁ Θεός μου, [πρόσχες μοι]*· *ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με* in the LXX. The Vulgate Psalm records '*Deus, Deus meus, quare dereliquisti me,*' similarly rendering *lama* as *quare* as in Jerome's *CM* quotation of *Matthew*. Leaving the consideration of the *CM* aside for the moment, it is unusual that the Vulgate Psalm should choose *quare* and yet the Vulgate *Matthew* reference should alternatively choose

<sup>22</sup> *Adversus Libros Rufini* 2.34 'nec hoc dicimus quod Septuaginta interpretes suggillemus ... ubi uero discrepant id posuisse in Graeco quod apud Hebraeos didicerant.'

*ut quid* should we be able to claim a common editorial tradition. When the source materials of the Hebrew and Greek are observed there is demonstrated a clear parallel between the Hebrew interrogative 'why,' *lama*, rendered as *quare* and the LXX's 'for what purpose,' ἵνα τί, rendered in Vulgate *Matthew* as *ut quid*. The fact that Jerome writes in accordance with the Vulgate Psalms and the Hebrew, and therefore against Vulgate *Matthew* based upon the LXX, is unsurprising in the context of Jerome's Hebrew proficiencies and vast knowledge of the source material. Consequently, while this may seem at first a small lexical difference, upon closer examination it becomes further evidence of the lack of connection between Vulgate *Matthew* and the editorial preferences of Jerome.

## Notable Exceptions

### *Matthew 6:11 supersubstantialem*

In all of the above sections, I have attempted to demonstrate the variable differences between Jerome's *CM* and the Vulgate tradition. Every example presents, in varying degrees, convincing evidence of Jerome's lack of knowledge of the Vulgate tradition. There rests, however, a single word in agreement that has significant theological importance and has been traditionally assigned as a landmark Vulgate translation: *supersubstantialem*. By the middle ages, Thomas Aquinas in his *Catena Aurea* was able to trace the word's usage for the Greek ἐπιούσιον to Jerome through the *CM*.<sup>23</sup> This attribution would influence further attribution henceforth.<sup>24</sup> However, our

---

<sup>23</sup> *Catena Aurea* 6.11 cites the *CM* of this very same section.

ability to confidently assign the translation to Jerome's editorial hand is not so easily done in light of contemporaneous evidence.

In view of the importance of the term through the medieval reception of the Vulgate, we must critically probe its origin. Is it truly as Eckhart, Aquinas, *et al.* had posited, and Jerome is the originator of the term? I would suggest that we set aside the Vulgate for a moment and consider other Patristic evidence for *supersubstantialem*. In four Paschal sermons on the Lord's Prayer from sometime before 410 until 416 (*Sermones* 56.9ff., 57.7, 58.5, 59.6) Augustine consistently translates the Greek word ἐπιούσιον as *cotidianum* and expounds upon the theological significance of the daily consumption.<sup>25</sup> Augustine either was ignorant of the usage in *supersubstantialem* or chose to ignore it.

However, a curious patristic connection can be made to Jerome's text outside of Jerome. Ambrose seems to have used the term multiple times, and indeed expounded upon its efficacy in rendering ἐπιούσιον at least twice before Jerome wrote his *CM*. In Ambrose's *de Fide* 3 (by 380)<sup>26</sup> and *de Sacramentis* (387-391)<sup>27</sup> a translation in *substantialem* is argued.

In *de Fide* Ambrose writes:

Or, can they possibly deny the *usian* reading, when the Lord said 'epiousion bread' and Moses wrote: Ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος? For what is οὐσία, and from whence is it said, if not ἀεὶ οὐσα, that which shall remain forever? For God is he who is and is forever, and therefore Divine Substance remaining always is said to be οὐσία. And for this reason bread is *epiusios*, as it furnishes the heart and soul with the substance of

<sup>24</sup> M. Vinzent, *Meister Eckhart, On the Lord's Prayer*, (2012) pp. 130-1, 240, 249, 251, fn. 165. Vinzent connects the heavy Thomist influence in this work of Eckhart and the citation of Jerome's discussion of the term.

<sup>25</sup> For a timeline of Augustine's *Sermones* see John E. Rotelle, *The Works of Saint Augustine*, vol. 1, (1990) 138-163 and *Augustini Sermones in Matthaëum I*, CCSL XLI Aa (2008) 150, 175, 196, 219, which relies heavily on A. Kunzelmann, 'Die Chronologie der Sermones des hl. Augustinus,' in *Studi Agostiniani, Miscellanea Agostiniana*, vol. 2 (1931).

<sup>26</sup> O. Faller, *De Fide, S. Ambrosii Opera Pars VIII*, (1962) 5-10. As the addressee is the Emperor Gratian, it cannot reasonably be placed any later than his death in 383.

<sup>27</sup> Dom B. Botte, *Ambroise de Milan: Des Sacrements, Des Mystères*, Sources Chrétiennes (1949) pp. 23-4. He further cites F.H. Dudden, *The Life and Times of St Ambrose*, (1935) 698 and J.R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'empire romain*, (1933) 541.

enduring strength from the substance of the Word. For it is written: *And bread strengthens the heart of men.* [Ps. 103:15].<sup>28</sup>

This text is a critically important reference point in our attempt to understand the origin of *supersubstantialem* for ἐπιούσιον. As stated above, this work must necessarily be dated prior to Jerome's Roman stay and supposed editorial work on the Gospels. While Ambrose does not compound *super* onto *substantialem*, his argument in favour of reassessing the Greek meaning beyond that of the temporal *cottidianum*. By refocusing the word as 'divine substance' in light of the Greek exempla, Ambrose's *de Fide* gives evidence of a similar translation to Jerome's prior to the assumed period of Vulgate authorship.

In the *de Sacramentis* example he introduces the expected *Vetus Latina* Matthew 6:11 in *quotidianum* but then continues:

Our bread? He says bread, but also ἐπιούσιον, that is, (*super*)*substantialem*. It is not bread that enters our body, but the bread of eternal life which supports the *substance* of our spirit. For this reason the Greek says ἐπιούσιον. The Latin called this bread '*quotidianum*/daily' whereas the Greeks say that it was '*aduenientem*/coming,' because the Greeks call the day to come τὴν ἐπίουσαν ἡμέραν. Therefore, which the Latin and Greek said both seem useful. The Greek expresses both senses in a single word, the Latin (simply) says *quotidianum*.<sup>29</sup>

There are quite a few peculiarities to discuss in this passage. First, I would like to draw attention to the citation of *latinus* or 'the Latin' and *graeci* or 'the Greek(s).' In

<sup>28</sup> An negare possunt usian lectam, cum et *panem epiusion* dominus dixerit et Moyses scripserit: Ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος? Aut quid est οὐσία uel unde dicta, nisi ἀεὶ οὐσα, quid semper maneat? Qui enim est et est semper, deus est, et ideo manens semper οὐσία dicitur diuina substantia. Et propterea *epiusion* panis, quod ex uerbi substantia substantiam uirtutis manentis cordi et animae subministret; scriptum est enim: *Et panis confirmat cor hominis* [Ps. 103:15]. (*de Fide* 3.15.127)

<sup>29</sup> *Panem nostrum?* Panem dixit, sed ἐπιούσιον, hoc est, (*super*)*substantialem*. Non iste panis est qui uadit in corpus, sed ille panis uitae aeternae qui animae nostrae substantiam fulcit. Ideo graece ἐπιούσιον dicitur. Latinus autem hunc panem *quotidianum* dixit quem graeci dicunt *aduenientem*, quia graeci dicunt τὴν ἐπίουσαν ἡμέραν *aduenientem* diem. Ergo quod latinus dixit et quod graecus utrumque utile uidetur. Graecus utrumque uno sermone significauit, latinus *quotidianum* dixit. (*de Sacramentis* 5.24)

discussing the Greek tradition of *Matthew* 6:11, Ambrose demonstrates considerable knowledge of its meaning. Significantly, he refers to the Greek tradition in the plural by noting what the ‘Greeks say’. Conversely, in reference to the Latin text, he refers only to a singular Latin. This singular Latin is the tradition he seems to want to contextualise in view of the more nuanced Greek original. It is apparent that this Latin is some *Vetus Latina* text.

I have placed *super* in brackets before *substantialem*. Faller’s critical edition chooses *substantialem*, but makes note in his *apparatus criticus* that seven of his twenty-six traditions and manuscripts compound in *super*, including one of the very oldest MSS from the ninth century, *Vaticanus bibliothecae Vaticanae antiquae Lat.* 474 (*E*), and the two early editions *Amerbachii Basileensis* (1492) and *Maurinorum* (1690). The inclusion of *super* in the case of the two early editions may be under the influence of the Vulgate text, but the inclusion of the other early MSS cannot be so simply explained. Whether or not Ambrose included *super*, his continued focus on the substantial nature of the bread is certain.

Returning to our established date of authorship sometime between 387 and 391 presents an interesting conundrum. If *de Sacramentis* was written during this period, it was written a full decade prior to Jerome’s *CM* and thus is our first point of contact with this tradition. If we must accept that the Vulgate *Matthew* as we have it is the work of Jerome in Rome sometime c. 384, that would suggest that Ambrose received and adopted this new translation within three to five years. However, as stated above, Ambrose seems to be proposing this consideration as a novelty and makes no reference to earlier precedent. Furthermore, *de Fide* allows us to locate an even earlier similar usage in the work of Ambrose. As *de Fide* was written before Jerome apparently submitted his Gospel translations, we have definite evidence of some form of *substantialem* prior to the supposed writing of the Vulgate.



Ambrose may have been citing an available text, yet his singular Latin reference which uses *quotidianum* would seem to imply that he saw himself as offering a unique or at least uncommon perspective. As will be further demonstrated below, this section of the *CM* demonstrates that unlike Ambrose, Jerome does reference work outside of his own to arrive at *supersubstantialem* demonstrating a preëxisting tradition.

If we set aside the traditional Hieronymian-Roman authorship of the Vulgate Gospels, Ambrose may very well have been the originator of this term. Without a doubt, Jerome could not have been the originator of this complicated term, and in no way does his inclusion of the term in *CM* tie Jerome to the edition of Vulgate *Matthew*.

In Jerome's case, it is beneficial to consider the entirety of his commentary:

Give us today our *supersubstantial* bread. That which we express as *supersubstantial*, has in the Greek *epiousion*, which the Seventy translators most frequently translated *periousion*. Therefore, we examined the Hebrew, and wherever they used *periousion*, we found *sogolla* which Symmachus translated *exaireton*, that is 'particular' or 'extraordinary,' and in this case might be interpreted as 'special.' Thus, when we seek that special or particular bread which God has bestowed upon us, we seek that for which it is said: 'I am the bread that comes down from heaven' [Jn. 6:51]. In the Gospel called According to the Hebrews, for *supersubstantial* bread I find *maar*, which is to say tomorrow, that the sense is: '*Our bread for tomorrow*,' that is in the future, '*give us today*.' Alternatively, we are able to understand *supersubstantial* bread, which is above all substance and reigns above the entirety of creation. Others simply reckon, following the sermon of the sayings of Paul: '*Having food and clothes, with these things we are content*' [1 Tim. 6:8], at the present moment as much as is holy is care paid to food, from which, in regard to those things to come, the teaching: '*Do not worry about tomorrow*' [Matt. 6:34].<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> *Panem nostrum supersubstantialem da nobis hodie*. Quod nos *supersubstantialem* expressimus, in graeco habetur ἐπιούσιον, quod LXX interpretes περιούσιον frequentissime transtulerunt. Considerauimus ergo in hebraeo, et ubicumque illi περιούσιον expresserant, nos inuenimus *sogolla* quod Symmachus εξαίρετον, id est praecipuum uel egregium, transtulit, licet in quodam loco peculiare interpretatus sit. Quando ergo petimus ut peculiarem uel praecipuum nobis Deus tribuat panem, illum petimus qui dicit: *Ego sum panis qui de caelo descendi* [Jn. 6:51]. In euangelio appellatur secundum Hebraeos pro supersubstantiali pane *maar* repperi, quod dicitur crastinum, ut sit sensus: *Panem nostrum crastinum*, id est futurum, *da nobis hodie*. Possumus *supersubstantialem* panem et aliter intellegere: qui super omnes substantias sit et uniuersas superet creaturas. Alii simpliciter putant, secundum apostoli sermonem dicentis: *Habentes uictum et uestitum his contenti sumus* [1 Tim. 6:8], de praesenti tantum cibo sanctos curam gerere, unde et in posterioribus sit praeceptum: *Nolite cogitare de crastino* [Matt. 6:34].

**Matthew 10:18**

et ad praesides et ad reges ducemini <sup>1</sup> propter me.	et ad praesides et ad reges ducemini propter me.	<i>a:</i> >ante reges et praesides stabitis propter me <i>b:</i> ad praesides...> et aput reges et praesides stabitis propter me <i>d:</i> >et ante praesides stabitis propter me
---	--	--

<sup>1</sup>: *aur fl*

A keen eye on the the associated table 1 (chapter 7) for this chapter will have noticed a further problem at *Matthew* 10:18. If we are driving towards a conclusion that the number of significant differences between Jerome's text and the Vulgate disqualifies the former from the origination of the latter, the identical treatment of a verse in departure from *Vetus Latina* tradition may be reason for pause. Where both Jerome and the Vulgate have *et ad praesides et ad reges ducemini propter me*, *Vetus Latina* abd demonstrate *ante/aput (reges) praesides stabitis propter me*. The impression that Jerome agrees with the Vulgate's break from tradition stands in opposition to everything discussed above.

As this thesis has endeavoured to demonstrate, further Patristic evidence is a necessary factor in determining true sources for translational variations. In this regard, Ambrose mostly agrees with the *Vetus Latina* renderings in his *Ep.* 74.4, writing *cum stabitis ante reges et praesides*. However, Tertullian records *Matthew* 10:18 nearly two centuries prior to the *CM* in his *Scorpiace* 9.4 as *et ad praesides et ad reges perducemini mei causa*. The striking similarity to both the *CM* and the Vulgate indicates that this individual rendering was not original to either. Rather, keeping in mind Jerome's lamentation in his *Praefatio in Euangelio* (*Preface*) that Old Latin versions of the New Testament were 'nearly as many as there are books,' Tertullian and Jerome must have been familiar with a similar *Vetus Latina* tradition. So too must the editor of the Vulgate had access to such a *Vetus Latina* rendering in [*per*]ducemini.

This case is important in demonstrating that a number of Latin manuscripts of the New Testament prior to the Vulgate, that is *Vetus Latina*, have been lost. This is significant for our study. A glance at the appendices will show some locations such as *Matthew* 10:18 where Jerome may more closely agree with the Vulgate than the small sample of *Vetus Latina* manuscripts presented. So too can a number of correspondences between all three *CM*, Vulgate, and *Vetus Latina* be found. Unquestionably the most important areas of disagreement are those found between the *CM* and the Vulgate. These areas indicate a separation between the traditional editor and his edition. Where *CM* and Vulgate may be in accord against the *Vetus Latina* provided, a number of other translations either known, lost, or reconstructed from Patristic authors likely may be the cause. This is precisely what has happened in this section. Evidently in the early third century Tertullian was aware of a translation that would be repeated at the turn of the fifth century by Jerome.

### ***Matthew* 14:35**

Et cum cognouissent eum uiri loci illius <sup>1</sup> , miserunt in uniuersam regionem illam.	Et cum cognouissent eum uiri loci illius, miserunt in uniuersam regionem illam.	<i>ab:</i> illius + <b>adorabant eum et confestim</b> <i>a:</i> eum > <b>illum</b> <i>d:</i> om. adorabant...confestim
<sup>1</sup> : om. adorabant... <i>aur</i> <i>d f ff<sup>2</sup> m.2 g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>		

This section provides an important instance in which the *Vetus Latina* MSS I have held to higher esteem, *a b*, would make Jerome and the Vulgate seem inexorably linked. The phrase *adorabant eum et confestim* is an integral component of both early *Vetus Latina* translation. However, a look at further evidence in *aur d f ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q* shows that the omission is far from a unique point to connect Jerome to the Vulgate. A number

of serious differences are found before and below this section in Jerome's *CM*. Just above in 14:34, Jerome opts to use the more literal *Genesareth* for his Hebrew transliteration whereas the Vulgate agreed with *a b* in *Gennesar*. Of course, 15:11 just a bit further down provides another of our clearest pieces of evidence to separate Jerome from Vulgate *Matthew* (*communicat/coinquinat*).

The Nestle-Aland Greek does not demonstrate any need for the extra *adorabant eum et confestim*. The Greek gives τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου \* ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ὅλην directly translated as *loci illius, miserunt in uniuersam...* The asterix notes where we should expect some equivalent for *adorabant eum et confestim*. Given the rarity of this addition and its clear lack of common Greek precedent, this is an example in which the Vulgate and Jerome agree simply because their agreement is the best solution. This suggests that *a b* recognized either a different Greek text or simply replicated an addition made to an earlier Latin translation of which the translators of *a b* were both aware.

### ***Matthew 17:22***

Conuersantibus autem <sup>1</sup> eis in Galilea dixit illis Iesus: {Filius hominis tradendus est} in manus hominum, et occident eum, et <b>tertia</b> <sup>2</sup> die resurget. Et contristati sunt uehementer.	Conuersantibus autem eis in Galilaea dixit illis Iesus: Filius hominis tradendus est in manus hominum, et occident eum, et <b>tertio</b> die resurget. Et contristati sunt uehementer.	<i>ab:</i> ~> <b>Ipsis]</b> autem conuersantibus; {> <b>Futurum est, ut filius hominis tradatur; &gt;et post tertium diem</b> <i>b:</i> dixit <i>om.</i> illis; > <b>in manibus</b> <i>d:</i> {}> <b>Incipiet filius hominis tradi</b> (Pseud.- Cyprian <i>de Rebap.</i> 1.9); > <b>et post tres dies;</b> uehementur> <b>ualde</b>
<sup>1</sup> : <i>aur f g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>		
<sup>2</sup> : <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>		

This section provides what I believe to be the strongest evidence linking Jerome to the Vulgate tradition. The section of greatest concern is delineated between the

brackets in the left *CM* column. Jerome's shared usage of *filius hominis tradendus est* against the *Vetus Latina* preference for *Futurum est...* is a small link to the Vulgate. I have only found Jerome's choice in *Vetus Latina aur l*, already texts corrupted by Vulgate readings. Patristic citations offer little in the way of support, although they are few and far between; *Bibindex* gives only a citation from Hilary's *Com. in Euang. Matt.* and Pseudo-Cyprian *de Repab.* 1.9 which both agree with the *Vetus Latina* against Jerome and the Vulgate.

However, a survey of the Greek can shed some light on the relatively small amount of Latin evidence. The *Vetus Latina* renderings (ex-*aur l*) are word for word translations of Μέλλει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοσθαι. *d ff*<sup>1</sup> are perhaps most direct in rendering *Incipiet ... tradi*. It is in sense, and not literalism, that the *CM* and Vulgate chose to forgo direct translation of Μέλλει along with an infinitive by rather incorporating the meaning into the periphrastic, future passive participle, *tradendus est*, he will be betrayed.

Let us return then to our tabled discussion of the *CM*'s 26:46. In this section we established that Jerome's use of the active periphrastic *traditurus est* was fully unique to the *CM*. However, this usage is clever in view of its predecessor in 17:22 predicting the eventual betrayal; in other words, the usage of the passive periphrastic for prophesy and then active periphrastic as the event is imminent is purposefully constructed in parallel. We should expect to find for the Vulgate, or indeed any *Vetus Latina* MSS, this well-crafted parallelism. We do not. While the periphrastic in 17:22 may initially read as evidence of Jerome's witness to the Vulgate (or *aur l*), the Vulgate choice (and *aur l*) to not use this parallel in 26:46 suggests that the similar translation may have been arrived at separately to the purposefully constructed text used in Jerome. Perhaps Jerome's *Matthew* and Vulgate/*aur l* sourced their 17:22 from a similar tradition, but they do not share the same editorial decision for 26:46.

**Matthew 21:44, a Stumbling Stone**

Qui ceciderit super lapidem istum confringetur, super quem uero ceciderit conteret eum. <sup>1</sup>	Qui ceciderit super lapidem istum confringetur, super quem uero ceciderit conteret eum.	<i>abd</i> : missing
<sup>1</sup> : present in, <i>aur c f g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i> <i>r<sup>1</sup></i> ; a near word for word (Greek) interpolation of Luke 20:18		

The inclusion of this line, which is absent in *a b d ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup>* but consistently present in the Vulgate tradition, is itself a stumbling stone for the idea that Jerome is not strongly connected to the Vulgate tradition; however, further examination of the underlying Greek text suggests a more complicated issue. As noted in the table above, the text is found in *aur c f g<sup>1</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup>* and thus experienced some usage in *Vetus Latina* traditions. In those *Vetus Latina* editions in which the verse is considered and translated there is very little variation. Perhaps the greatest variation, as related by Jülicher, is found in *h* as conteret>**sicut puluerem comminuet**. Otherwise, the Latin texts maintain nearly identical forms as found in Jerome and the Vulgate. This is to suggest that Jerome's version and the Vulgate's are not necessarily directly or intrinsically linked, but may rather share commonalities in *Vetus Latina* sources.

The Nestle Aland edition brackets this verse and directs the reader to *Luke* 20:18 and suggests that *Matthew* 21:44 is an interpolation of the Lucan text. An examination of the two Greek originals sheds light on their commonality. *Matthew* 21:44 has: Καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον συνθλασθήσεται. ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ λικμήσει αὐτόν. And *Luke* 20:18: Πᾶς πεσὼν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν λίθον συνθλασθήσεται. ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ

λικμήσει αὐτόν. Despite the nearly identical Greek source, Vulgate *Luke*'s treatment is noticeably different as: *omnis qui ceciderit supra illum lapidem conquassabitur supra quem autem ceciderit comminuet illum*. The change *conteret*>**comminuet** is reminiscent of the change found in *h*, yet not identical. The largest difference, *confringetur*>**conquassabitur**, suggests a significant editorial difference. At the very least, this suggests editorial inconsistency on the part of the Vulgate's editor.

Unfortunately, Biblindex does not provide any Hieronymian instances of *Luke* 20:18 in order to compare with this usage of *Matthew* 21:44. For that matter, *Luke* 20:18 turns up no results on the server. However, the Vulgate editor's acknowledgement of the interpolated verse in *Matthew* is far from unique in the *Vetus Latina* tradition and cannot be used to link Vulgate *Matthew* to Jerome given its widespread use. However, it does suggest that either Jerome was aware of a Greek manuscript which included the line, or that Jerome was working from at least one Latin text like those listed above.

### Grammatical Differences

When all of the *lemmata* of the *CM* are compared directly to the Vulgate tradition of *Matthew* many instances of prepositional and case difference are demonstrable. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, to discuss each and every one of these hundreds of small differences may only serve to illustrate the complications present in the transmission of a document. I have endeavoured in this regard to pinpoint differences that form identifiably different patterns than those presented in Vulgate *Matthew*. Importantly, many of these differences break certain translational 'rules' with which the Vulgate has been defined. Various renderings in Latin of certain Greek prepositions follow:

## Greek εἰς + Accusative

The Plater and White *A Grammar of the Vulgate*, established as a measuring stick for Vulgate in the above chapter on the definition of the Vulgate tradition, states that Latin *in* + ablative is only used ‘wrongly for εἰς’ in the Vulgate (§ 117B.7). Rather, it instructs that the expected treatment of Greek εἰς + accusative is Latin *in* + accusative, for which it presents many examples. Certainly, the Vulgate does prefer this particular rendering. However, Jerome’s *CM* and the Vulgate disagree rather consistently in their treatments of this grammatical construction. Of the 13 instances where *in* + accusative/ablative is the opposite in the two texts, 6 concern Greek εἰς + accusative and all are translated by the ablative in the *CM* and the accusative in the Vulgate. All save for 6:34 (for which *CM* uses *de*) use the preposition *in* in both traditions.

Verse	Greek	Abl:Acc	Meaning in Vulgate
4:1	εἰς τὴν ἔρημον	CM:V	Eis+acc Led up into
(6:34)	εἰς τὴν αὐρίον	CM:V	Eis+Acc concerning CM(de):V(in)
11:7	Τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον	CM:V	Eis+acc Go into (4:1)
13:2	εἰς πλοῖον	CM:V	Eis+acc Go into
24:9	εἰς θλίψιν	CM:V	Eis+acc Hand over to
28:1	εἰς μίαν	CM:V	Eis+acc



			Towards the first
--	--	--	-------------------

In each instance except for 6:34 the preposition εἰς governs the Greek accusative to demonstrate motion toward; however, 6:34 still maintains the case relationship CM (ablative) : Vulgate (accusative), however here to mean ‘concerning’.

Our earlier consideration of consistent grammatical innovations as a central landmark in the discernment of Latin Vulgate MSS would suggest that Jerome in the *CM* is rather consistently breaking a fundamental Vulgate translation in *Matthew*. The preference of the *CM* to indicate ablative position for εἰς rather than accusative directional force is a clear indication of a difference in translational opinion, no matter which can be considered to be of superior Latinity. Such consistency in Jerome's work suggests that his Latin *Matthew*'s translator followed a rather different approach to the treatment of εἰς indicating motion.

Evidence found in contemporary Patristic and *Vetus Latina* MSS provide compelling evidence that Jerome's ablative was in fact the rarer option and was against the expected accusative in most *Vetus Latina* traditions (such a usage was however in accord with *Codex Vercellensis*). In 4:1, Ambrose in his *Commentary on Luke* 4.7.1 uses the accusative *in desertum* as does *Codex Veronensis* (*b*). 11:7 similarly has Ambrose (*Exameron* 5.33.77) agreeing with *b* as well as *Codex Bezae* (*d*) with another accusative *in desertum*. 13:2 provides an even greater wealth of *Vetus Latina* exempla with the accusative found in *b* (*in nauiculam*), *Codex Palatinus* (*e*) (*nauem*), and *Codex Corbeiensis* (*ff*<sup>2</sup>) (*in nauiculam*); *d* breaks the mold here (*nauī*) and agrees with *a* (*nauicula*) in using an ablative.

In examples listed above Jerome's *CM* finds its only consistent agreement in *a* for using the preposition *in* + ablative. This exercise has thus served to demonstrate that the Vulgate usage of the accusative after εἰς/*in* was in fact the traditional treatment and

the ablative rendering found in *CM* corresponds to very little evidence outside of *a*. As in the individual lexical issues discussed at length in the previous section, this considerable deviation from the Vulgate choices provides consistent evidence throughout the body of the *CM* of divergent traditions. This does not, however, suggest that Jerome's text was necessarily *a* or in the family of *a*. Rather, both the translator of *a* and Jerome's *Matthew* held a similar perspective for the translation of these Greek instances; thus, the translator of Jerome's *Matthew* at least did not simply copy over the bulk of traditional texts, and at most set out to purposefully correct them. In any event, the text seems to be consistently different than the Vulgate's adoption of the popular accusative.

Prepositional issues exist outside of the treatment of εἰς. Jerome's *CM* twice prefers *de* to the Vulgate's *a(b)* in 9:16 (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱματίου) and 21:25 (ἐξ οὐρανοῦ). So too, the *CM* uses *de* for Vulgate *ex* in 19:3 (κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν), *ex* for *a* in 5:18, *pro* for *de* in 12:36, *intra* for *contra* in 12:25, *intra* for *inter* in 16:8, and *in* for *contra* twice in 24:7. Unlike the wealth of examples provided by Jerome's text of *Matthew* provides a demonstrably variable treatment of εἰς, it is much more difficult to establish a pattern of difference in Jerome's text of *Matthew* and the Vulgate as it regards these examples. Nonetheless, they are illustrative of the uniqueness of each tradition.

### **Conclusions: Jerome's Edition of *Matthew***

This study is naturally limited to those citations readily found in the work of Jerome. There are some sections in *Matthew* with easily identifiable variations through the history of the Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* which could serve to locate the source of Jerome's Gospels. For example, Jülicher identifies nine variations in 5:11 (μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἰπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν ψευδόμενοι ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ.) between Stuttgart and his collated *Vetus Latina* exemplars.

ὀνειδίσωσιν is variably *exprobauerint*, *persequentur*, *maledixerint*, or *odio habuerint* with variable word order and addition of *homines*. Likewise are the treatments of καὶ διώξωσιν and καὶ εἰπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ' ὑμῶν identifiably different throughout the thirteen examples provided by Jülicher. Unfortunately, a clear reference to *Matthew* 5:11 is not to be found in the Hieronymian corpus. Thus, a full appraisal of Jerome's true text of *Matthew* at any point in time is particularly difficult. The *CM* is by far the most complete reproduction of Jerome's text of *Matthew*, but from the beginning jumps between verses (this starts from the onset as Jerome cites pieces of 1:1,3,4 and then jumps to 1:8-9,12,16).

Having considered all of the above readings, can we establish a link between Jerome and the Vulgate tradition? To answer this question, we must first ask the foundational question that it implies: is Jerome's *CM*, written at the conclusion of the fourth century, a witness to Vulgate *Matthew*? In my appraisal, the answer is no. True, the entirety of the exempla I have collected, as demonstrated in the accompanying table (chapter 7), include both notable differences as well as possible similarities. When we turn to possible sources for divergent readings, Jerome's text is at best a jumbled collection of *Vetus Latina* MSS and Patristic citations alike. The great number of substantial differences between the two gathered traditions are too numerous, too significant, to attest to Jerome's witness of the Vulgate text as recorded from the earliest in *Fuldensis* or *Sangallensis* and throughout the Vulgate's history.

Let us first reconsider those verses where Jerome may have shown witness to clear Vulgate forms: 6:11, 10:18, 14:35, and 17:22. 6:11's *supersubstantialem* could be original to Jerome; however, we were able to establish clear precedent links to Ambrose, whose work was nevertheless written before the *CM*. 10:18 was specifically discussed to further demonstrate how some seemingly unique Vulgate choices can be sourced to outside Patristic sources; in this case, Tertullian's reading of the verse was in

agreement with both the Vulgate and Jerome, two centuries prior to the *CM*. In 14:35, the maintenance of extraneous material from the lack of diligent copying was seen; *a b* included an extra four words that had no source in Greek texts. In fact, the majority of *Vetus Latina* sources in Jülicher's work likewise omitted the phrase. As such, 14:35 serves as a paradigm for the many occasions where Jerome may seem a witness to the Vulgate if only held up to a small body of *Vetus Latina* examples. Finally, the *CM* at 17:22 seems to carry a unique Vulgate reading. We demonstrated that this reading is especially appropriate, if rare, when held in parallel to the similar construction in 26:46; however, the Vulgate-like *aur l* and the Vulgate itself all dispense with the clever parallelism found in Jerome's text of *Matthew*. Then, Jerome's text as a whole is unique, and while it may source from a similar font, is indisputably different on the whole.

Perhaps the four examples of similarity are more simply explained by attributing Jerome with the Vulgate and the Vulgate with Jerome. Yet, the vast number of differences, many also discussed above, must also be weighed against the few similarities. When we consider how different the *CM's Matthew* is to Vulgate *Matthew*, it is more reasonable that the similarities are simply sourced from a similar tradition and the differences from a different tradition. The question remains: is the similar source Jerome's original work?

It is obvious that if Jerome were the originator of Vulgate *Matthew*, a great number of changes have altered the Vulgate text to the point of near total obfuscation; and only occasionally do small pieces of the original shine forth, as in our four possible sections of exceptions. Of course, with the time between Jerome's life in Rome (380's) and the publication of the first Vulgate Gospels *Sangallensis* (450's) and *Fuldensis* (540's) we are faced with between 70 and 160 intervening years. The conclusion that springs forth from this line of enquiry is simple: at most, Jerome was the originator of a

Vulgate-like text family. However, we have shown that this is potentially troublesome given the number of dissimilarities between the two. What I find far more plausible and easier to claim is that Jerome, while potentially familiar with similar Italic editions of the fourth century, produced his own text separate from the creation of Vulgate *Matthew*.

In sum, we are fortunate to have such a rich document from which to sample the text of Jerome's Gospel of *Matthew*. It has provided numerous potential sources for pieces of *Matthew* as known to Jerome and must be considered in a full appraisal of the saint's connection to the Vulgate Gospels.

## Chapter 6

### The Gospel of Mark: Jerome's Homilies

The *Tractatus in Marci Evangelium*, or *Homilies on Mark* (HM), were only in the last century properly considered the work of Jerome after a period of debate.<sup>1</sup> For a text that still required defence as ‘une oeuvre authentique de Jérôme’<sup>2</sup> only a decade ago, it is unsurprising that there are yet still certain uncertainties. The critically important provenance of the texts is among those uncertainties. Unlike the *Commentary on Matthew* above, the *Homilies* are a collection of works for which a variable window of time may be reasonably posited. However, Gourdain orients the *Homilies* as after the Origenist controversy and therefore after at least 393, but more likely still after 397.<sup>3</sup> He dates the last of the *Homilies* as likely to have been produced around 402.<sup>4</sup> This gives us a five-year period of production of a number of relatively short tracts, whereas the *Commentary* was notable for its length and production in only two weeks’ time. Also unlike the *Commentary*, the *Homilies* use Scripture as a rhetorical device and thus the lemmata are incidental to the work as a whole. In the case of the *Commentary*, the citations of *Matthew* were the cause itself for the work’s creation. The *Homilies* were necessarily unique productions, with some such as 2A opening with a reference to the Sunday service in which it was proclaimed.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As summarized by the sole authoritative text provided by the *Sources chrétiennes* series 494, *Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, Text: Germain Morin, Introduction, Translation, and Notes: Jean-Louis Gourdain (2005), 9-12.

<sup>2</sup> Gourdain, (2005), 11.

<sup>3</sup> *op. cit.* 12.

<sup>4</sup> *op. cit.* 14.

<sup>5</sup> *op. cit.* 16; *Homily 2A*, 1.2-3.

The consideration of the work as authentically Jerome has been questioned by a few scholars in recent works.<sup>6</sup> Notably, J.-C. Haelewyck notes certain problems he sees in the *HM* as potentially indicative of an uncertain author. The following short discussion will analyse Haelewyck's observations and provide some reasons his disqualification from Jerome can be considered overeager.<sup>7</sup> Haelewyck provides 31 different verses found in the *HM* that have 'des divergences par rapport à l'édition de Wordsworth-White [sic]'. Many of these differences are discussed in this chapter. First, the use of Wordsworth-White (Oxford Edition) as a Vulgate text in lieu of the Stuttgart edition is questionable. Regardless, his study proves the point of this chapter, namely, that the *HM* contains enough divergent readings when compared to the Vulgate text as to call into question the authorship of one of the two texts. Haelewyck's perspective, that the *HM* cannot be Jerome's because of the differences with the Vulgate, is the inverse perspective of this chapter. Haelewyck's constant is Jerome's involvement with the Vulgate and suggests Jerome may not be involved in the *HM* due to these differences. The present thesis suggests that Jerome's involvement in the Vulgate should be proven using proven Hieronymian texts.

Haelewyck's discussion on the *HM*'s *Mark* 5:41 makes some convincing arguments which might suggest Jerome could not have been involved with the *HM*. 5:41 forms an important discussion in this chapter as it clearly makes an appeal to change the translation which can be found in the Vulgate tradition. As will be seen below, the author of the *HM* seeks to (hyper)correct the Aramaic *kumi* as *surge mihi*, which Haelewyck calls 'une erreur grossière: il confond la terminaison *-i* de l'impératif féminin avec le pronom suffixe de la première personne'.<sup>8</sup> He continues by presenting his analysis (using Gramcord) that in 'la très grande majorité des cas' of 309 uses in the

<sup>6</sup> Recently, H.A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament* (2016) 160 citing J.-C. Haelewyck, *Evangelium Secundum Marcum*, fasc. 1 (2013) 21-3.

<sup>7</sup> Haelewyck (2013) 21-3.

<sup>8</sup> Haelewyck (2013) 21.

Hebrew Testament, the Vulgate tradition renders *kumi* as an imperative without the first person personal pronoun. He summarises his theory succinctly: ‘Mais peut-on raisonnablement penser qu’après avoir rendu près de 300 fois correctement la forme verbale en latin, Jérôme puisse encore confondre la terminaison de l’impératif féminin avec celle du prenom suffixe?’<sup>9</sup> Put simply, yes. Haelewyck’s observation relies assumes that Jerome’s treatment of the Hebrew *quomi* must be identical to the maladroit insertion of Aramaic (Syrian) by the Evangelist. Haelewyck includes Jerome’s *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nonimum*, dated by Haelewyck as 389, which has *talitha cumi puella surge syrum est*. While true that this example does not include personal pronouns, (including the omission of σοὶ λέγω, rendered *tibi dico* in the Vulgate) it does identify the language as *syrum*. The *HM* likewise identifies the language as *syra*. There is no argument for translation in one way or another. The only useful evidence from this text is the identical identification of language indicating a similar concentration on Semitic linguistics.

*Ep. 57.7* on translation is presented as further evidence that Jerome could not have been involved in the *HM*. Haelewyck dates the *HM* as 397-402 and *Ep. 57* as 396, making the epistle slightly older than the homilies.<sup>10</sup> The pertinent section is cited here:

Legimus in Marco dicentem Dominum: *Talitha cumi*, statimque subiectum est, “quod interpretatur. puella, tibi dico, surge”. Arguatur Euangelista mendacii, quare addiderit, *tibi dico*, cum in Hebraeo tantum sit, *puella surge*. Sed ut ἐμφατικώτερον faceret; et sensum uocantis atque imperantis exprimeret, addidit, *tibi dico*.<sup>11</sup>

This argument, as the argument provided in *Heb. nom.* above, is primarily concerned with the inclusion of σοὶ λέγω or *tibi dico* in Latin. In fact, neither of Haelewyck’s provided citations speak in any way about the inclusion or omission of *mihi* for *talitha*

<sup>9</sup> Haelewyck (2013) 22.

<sup>10</sup> Haelewyck (2013) 21-2.

<sup>11</sup> Jerome *Ep. 57.7*.



*kumi*. Jerome's later homily likewise omits *tibi dico*, consistent with the citations provided above. If Jerome was the editor of Vulgate *Mark* should we not also expect the Vulgate to omit, or at least explain, *tibi dico*. Nothing is said of *mihi* and it may be considered that Jerome had found a compromise to the problem of *tibi dico* through a hypercorrection he perceived to be correct from his studies of *Syrum* Aramaic. What Haelewyck's citations do prove is a preoccupation on Jerome's part with *Mark* 5:41. The citation in *HM* may be the final instance Jerome dealt with a problem he had grappled with for a demonstrable period of his career and he may have presented the inclusion of *mihi* as his solution. The modern commentator's displeasure with the result should not disqualify the text as Hieronymian. On the contrary, Haelewyck has shown quite clearly that Jerome focused on this verse and that the sort of discussion provided in his homily mimics discussions found in his other writings as well.

The arguments summarized by Gourdain as summarized above provide considerable evidence of Jerome's attachment to this work. Haelewyck's two major contentions against a Hieronymian authorship are (1) the differences in lemmata between the *HM* and the Vulgate, and (2) the homilist's beliefs on the rendering of *Mark* 5:41. This thesis agrees with the first contention and uses the present chapter to analyse the implications of such differences. The second problem regarding *Mark* 5:41 at least demonstrates a common preoccupation for the rendering of the Aramaic for both the homilist and Jerome. This does not mean that Jerome could not be the homilist, but to the contrary may provide further linkage between his earlier works and this rather late career group of homilies.

This difference in purpose and creation of the *Homilies* in contrast with a commentary does perhaps diminish some of the lemmata's importance. The very first example for observation, *Mark* 1:6, appears in two different forms in abutting *Homilies*. Whether this indicates Jerome's variable choice of reading or simply rhetorical

differences is difficult to discern. However, in this chapter I have focused mainly on those examples that make clearly different arguments than those found in the Vulgate's treatment. *Mark* 5:41, 8:24, and 14:3 below each concern major differences in translation that Jerome's text evidently aims to correct. In 5:41, for example, he decries the ancient mistranslation of Aramaic *Talitha kumi* as 'Girl, I tell you, rise' and instructs rather 'Girl, rise for me'. 8:24 sees Jerome praising the 'beautifully said' ἀναβλέψας to mean *suspiciens* and reasons against the Vulgate's translation in *aspiciens*. And in 14:3, the historically confusing ἄρδου πιστικῆς, which the Vulgate introduced to Western posterity as *nardi spicati*, receives alternate treatment in Jerome's homily.

This chapter and its accompanying table 3 (chapter 7) takes the Latin Text of the *Homilies* and its numbering from Germain Morin's text (*CCL* 78) as found in the above cited *Sources chrétiennes* number 494.<sup>12</sup> I have included the number of each homily not simply as procedure; I hope that such indications might speak to the length and spread of this five-year project on *Mark* and that the divisions might speak to possible variations over time.

### Mark 1:6 *Tractatus* 1A.90 and 1B.3

Et erat Iohannes uestitus <b>de</b> pilis	Et erat Iohannes uestitus pilis <b>cameli</b> et
<b>camelorum</b> et zona pellicia, et <b>cibus</b> eius	zona pellicia <b>circa lumbos eius</b> et
<b>locustae</b> et mel siluestre.	<b>lucustas</b> et mel siluestre <b>edebat</b>

The central interest in this instance is the missing *circa lumbos eius* in the first instance in the *HM*. This phrase is not found in our early Latin MSS as indicated in the

<sup>12</sup> in *Marci Evangelium* (Homilies on Mark, Tractatus), CCSL 78, ed. G. Morin, B. Capelle, J. Fraipont (1958).

table 3 (chapter 7) accompanying this chapter. Jülicher is helpful in identifying that its absence or presence fell into two different camps: the absence of the phrase is characteristic in MSS *a b d ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup> t*, and its presence was found in *aur c fl q* and Vulgate. Given the commonality of its omission in a number of traditions likely available to Jerome, the absence here must be seen as consequential.

Jerome declines two nouns differently, *camelorum* for *cameli* and *locustae* for *lucustas*. Jülicher does not demonstrate any variations for *cameli* or *lucustas*, leaving Jerome's usage to be unique from any readily identifiable MSS tradition. Furthermore, *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate tradition chose some formation of *edere* as indicated in the above Vulgate example. Jerome forgoes this possibility and instead inserts *cibus* with an implied *erat*, i.e. 'his food was locusts and wild honey,' rather than the *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate, 'he ate locusts and wild honey'.

*Homily 1B*, however, opens with a nearly identical citation to the *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate example. It uses *pilis cameli* and includes *circa lumbos eius*, where this second citation ends. The 1A and 1B versions are distinct in locations identifiable as common for variation. As such, Jerome seems to have either dictated the verse uniquely as fit his homily or worked from at least two separate *Mark* translations.

### Mark 1:17 *Tractatus 1.105*

Et dixit eis Iesus: Uenite post me, et faciam	Et dixit eis Iesus: Uenite post me, et
uos piscatores hominum.	faciam uos <b>feri</b> piscatores hominum

Jerome's omission of the complementary infinitive *feri* stands out against the tradition of Latin translations of 1:17. As noted in the table (chapter 7, table 3) for this chapter, *b* similarly omits the word, and Jülicher adds only *r<sup>1</sup>*. Otherwise, Jülicher indicates that the inclusion of the word is an established *Vetus Latina* practice. The omission, while of little gravity syntactically, can be aligned with only a few other non-

Vulgate choices. The Vulgate itself consistently includes *fieri* throughout all Vulgate MSS, as recorded by the Stuttgart edition. The distance between Jerome and *fieri* is further emphasized by Jerome's usage in the *Comm. in Hierem.* In the table (chapter 7, table 2) on this commentary, I indicate *Mark* 1:17 as the identical *Matthew* 4:19. In this usage, again, Jerome omits *fieri*. For this omission in *Matthew* 4:19, Jülicher lists only *h* as a source. Thus, we cannot cross any two *Vetus Latina* sources (*b, r<sup>1</sup>/h*) to find such a consistent omission. However, it does not seem that the inclusion of *fieri* was a readily available choice for Jerome, including through his career-end Commentary on Jeremiah. Thus, it stands to reason that Jerome is not an obvious witness to Vulgate *Mark* 1:17 or *Matthew* 4:19.

### Mark 5:41 *mihi* v. *tibi*, *Tractatus* 3.68

Talitha kumi: quod <b>interpretatur</b> , Puella surge <b>mihi</b>	Ait illi talitha cumi quod <b>est</b> <b>interpretatum</b> , Puella <b>tibi</b> dico surge
---	---

This section found in Jerome's third homily on *Mark* allows the scholar to flex some of his muscle on Aramaic and Hebrew in his homily. Such a demonstration leads to a rather different conclusion found throughout both *VL* and Vulgate MSS. Given Jerome's rather involved defence of his preference over that found within the Vulgate, it must be seen as crafted purposefully to be directly in opposition to the common reading.

The passage in question deals with the miraculous raising of Jairus's daughter by Christ. The words uttered by Jesus are preserved in Aramaic in *Mark* 5:41 and rendered in both Jerome's *HM* and the Vulgate as: *talitha k(/c)umi*. Where they differ is in the Evangelist's interpretation of this phrase: Jerome records, *quod interpretatur*, *Puella surge mihi*, whereas the Vulgate has, *quod est interpretatum*, *Puella tibi dico*

*surge*. The reading in *tibi* must have been known to Jerome when he states 'If he had said, *Talitha kum*, that would be translated, 'Girl rise.' ... *Kumi*, that is, 'rise for me.'... 'Girl rise for me,' not by your own merit, but through my grace!'<sup>13</sup> Jerome reminds his audience of his proficiencies in 'the Aramaic and Hebrew languages'<sup>14</sup> and seeks to correct errant translation that he feels lacks the correct theological force of Jesus as the actor.

The *Vetus Latina* texts could scarcely be blamed, however. I have found no early examples *abd* to match with this reframed perspective. A turn to Jülicher's *Itala* shows that there is absolutely no variation found for *Puella, tibi dico*. The Greek (*NA*) states Ταλιθα κουμ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε, providing evidence for *kum* and 'I say to you, rise,' and not the command 'rise for me!' Jerome's quarrel may be sourced back to the Evangelist himself and his incorrect translation of the Aramaic of Christ. Jerome's correction is contrary to all identifiable Latin manuscript traditions and stands out as one of the clearest vestiges of his personal editorial pen. It would, therefore, be remarkably difficult to defend the Vulgate's parroting of the standard translation as the work of Jerome in light of his learned argument against this tradition.

### Mark 5:43 *Tractatus* 3.87

et praecepit illis uehementer	et praecepit illis uehementer
ut tacerent et nulli	ut nemo id sciret
dicerent	

At the end of his third homily, Jerome presents a significantly different method to arrive at essentially the same meaning in his discussion of *Mark* 5:43. The Greek is: καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο. Jerome's *HM* suggests that Christ

<sup>13</sup> Si diceret, Talitha kum, interpretaretur, Puella surge: nunc uero quia dixit, Talitha kumi ... Kumi, hoc est, surge mihi. ... Puella surge mihi: non tuo merito, sed mea gratia. (*HM* 5)

<sup>14</sup> Syra et Hebraea lingua (*HM* 5)

orders those witnesses to his miracle to be silent and to tell not a single person. The Vulgate rather more directly, in view of the Greek, states that Christ's order is that 'none should know of it.' The difference between the two choices is considerable, given that Jerome's presents a different method, and likely had either a different Greek text (suggesting that Christ urged silence) or was working from a *Vetus Latina* text with a different preference than the Vulgate example.

The search for evidence of Jerome's choice outside of the *HM* leads to frustration. *Vetus Latina* MSS *a b* choose *ne quis hoc scire* and *ut nemo istut agnosceret*, respectively. Outside of these two important examples, Jülicher lists four different ways to indicate the name idea of insuring that 'none shall know.' Only one variation, found in *c d ff<sup>2</sup>*, suggests speaking as *nemini dicerent*. There is no identifiable example that lists *ut tacerent et nulli dicerent* as found here in the *HM*. Given the consistency of the Vulgate tradition's usage and its commonality in the *Vetus Latina* MSS, it is evident that Jerome was working from another textual tradition that had yet another method to translate this section. Other than his version's passing resemblance to *c d ff<sup>2</sup>*, it is altogether more likely that his example comes from a source otherwise unknown to the manuscript history.

### Mark 8:1-2 *Tractatus* 4.1

In diebus illis, cum turba multa esset <b>Iesu</b> , nec haberent quod <b>manducaret</b> , conuocatis discipulis ait illis: Misereor <b>turbae</b> , quia ecce triduo <b>sustinuit</b> , nec habent quod manducent	In illis diebus, <b>iterum</b> cum turba multa esset nec haberent quod <b>manducarent</b> , conuocatis discipulis ait illis: Misereor <b>super turba</b> quia ecce <b>iam</b> triduo <b>sustinent</b> me nec habent quod manducent
--	--

The variations between Jerome's homily and the Vulgate at *Mark* 8:1-2 are individually insignificant. I address them here given the consistency of variations in

these short two verses when set alongside the Vulgate example. Furthermore, the *Vetus Latina* traditions, as demonstrated by Jülicher, present at least fifty differences of varying significance through 8:1-2. I therefore find it necessary to discuss this section; when all differences are taken together it is evident that Jerome's text, like those of his predecessors, was widely variant in small details and thus cannot be called directly iterative of any, let alone the Vulgate.

Jerome's text forgoes *iterum* in the first line, a trait held in common only with *q* in the Jülicher text. The singular *manducaret* in Jerome's text finds only *ff<sup>2</sup>* in accord, with the Vulgate's *manducarent* the most common choice (*d* in an orthographical variant uses *manducent*, and *a* uniquely chooses *ederent*). The singular verb in this location is rare. Jerome's omission of *super* (*/supra* [*q*]) is shared only with *a* *f*; however, both *a* and *f* read *turbæ +huic*. The variation between *sustinuit* (Jerome) and *sustinent* (Vulgate) is apparent, but more ought to be said on this section. Jülicher records a remarkable amount of variations available for what he reckons in the consensus to be: *triduum iam est ex quo hic sunt nec habent*. The shortened form in *sustinere* can be found extra-Vulgate only in *aur* and *l*. I find no parallel with the singular perfect *sustinuit* Jerome uses.

In sum, then, we have one variation in agreement with *q* only, one in agreement with *ff<sup>2</sup>* only, one partially with *a* and *f*, and a final with *aur* and *l*. This should not be read as an implication that Jerome was here inserting myriad variations he had read, but rather should suggest that this section presented particular difficulty to distinct translators. As such, the Vulgate's renderings apparently sourced from preëxisting renderings found in *Vetus Latina* traditions represent its nature as collative. Jerome's text does not exhibit the same collation as the compiler of the Vulgate.

**Mark 8:24 *suspiciens* v. *aspiciens*, Tractatus 5.80**Et **suspiciens** ait | Et **aspiciens** ait

This section is of particular importance given Jerome's explicit argumentation against a solid and innovative Vulgate choice. The fifth homily introduces this curious lexical dissimilarity. The lemmatised section in question is rather short, but contains a specific difference in translation for which Jerome subsequently argues. Jerome's discussion of Christ's healing of the blind man in his fifth homily on *Mark*. During a transitional phase in which the blind man was progressively healing, he looks up at the crowd and sees them as if 'trees walking.' Jerome describes his looking up and beginning to speak as *et suspiciens ait* whereas the Vulgate prefers *et aspiciens ait*. The difference may on face value seem trivial, but Jerome apparently knew of the rendering in *aspiciens* and expressly counters that reading. 'It is beautifully said (in the Greek) as ἀναβλέψας, that is **suspiciens**, looking up, for however long he had been blind *deorsum aspiciebat* he was looking straight down. Now *sursum aspexit*, he looked straight up, and was healed.'<sup>15</sup> Jerome then continues with another lemma and restates *Suspiciens ait...* Apparently for Jerome or his translation, the succinct force of *suspiciens* better captured the motion of the blind man's gaze as given by ἀναβλέψας than did *aspicere* + an adverb.

An examination of *Vetus Latina* traditions lends further perspective into the uniqueness of Jerome's choice in *HM. Codex Vercellensis* prefers *respiciens* whereas *Codex Veronensis* suggests the Vulgate rendering in *aspiciens*. This demonstrates that the Vulgate choice was not innovative, but at least a potential echoing of the choice

---

<sup>15</sup> Pulchre dixit ἀναβλέψας, hoc est suspiciens, qui quamdiu caecus erat deorsum aspiciebat: sursum aspexit, et sanatus est. (HM 5).



found in the tradition relayed by the Italian *b*. Such a reference in the Vulgate back to the tradition found in *b* would be supported by the Burkitt suggestion that *b* formed the basis for the Vulgate revision.<sup>16</sup> Despite this connection, Jerome suggests *suspiciens* as a potential innovation in and of itself. Jülicher instructively shows *aspiciens* in nine of his eleven examples, showing only *a* and *c* (an omission) to veer from the course. In the case of Jülicher's variations, the Italian examples either omit the word or choose *respiciens*; only African *k* writes *susp<ic>iens*. Jerome was intentionally subverting established tradition, and was set to demonstrate his knowledge of what he saw to be improper usage. His term is innovative, and as in many other examples, is detrimental to the argument that Vulgate *Mark* was closely linked to Jerome.

### Mark 9:2, *Tractatus* 6.138

Qualia fullo <b>non potest in</b>	Qualia fullo <b>super terram</b>
<b>terra</b> facere	<b>non potest candida</b> facere

This verse is directly parallel with the synoptic account of *Matthew* 17:2, which mostly in agreement with all of our three source traditions: the *CM*, the Vulgate, and the *Vetus Latina*. However, *Mark*'s discussion of the transfiguration is found in a significantly different form in Jerome's *Homilies* than as we might expect to find in both the Vulgate tradition and the *Vetus Latina* traditions.

First, the similarities between the accounts in *Matthew* and *Mark* as related by the Vulgate tradition bear mentioning. In *Matthew* we read, 'uestimenta autem eius facta sunt alba sicut nix.' Vulgate *Mark* very similarly has, 'uestimenta eius facta sunt splendentia candida nimis uelut nix.' The parallel constructions are remarkably clear, if somewhat surprising in their variable usage of *alba/candida*; in Vulgate *Matthew* λευκά

<sup>16</sup> As reported by Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, (2005) 102.

becomes *alba* and in Vulgate *Mark* λευκᾶναι becomes *candida facere*. The two sections differ in the section in question. Rather, *Matthew*'s version continues thereafter with 'et ecce apparuit...' whereas *Mark*'s 'et apparuit...' comes after the short sentence in consideration in the table above. Thus, translators had even less precedent in *Matthew* to follow. This may account for the wide variability of translations found in the MSS history.

Jerome returns to the beginning of *Mark* 9 further into the sixth homily. Jerome cites the remainder of *Mark* 9:1-2 in the preceding sections in nearly identical fashion with the Vulgate and *Vetus Latina* traditions (*a b*). Where he diverges is where the traditions also diverge. In this reiterative statement the Vulgate states that the vestments of Christ became 'so brilliantly white as that no fuller on earth (*super terram*) is able to do.' Jerome's version relies on the already stated *splendentia et candida nimis* in the above section and simply states 'such that no fuller on earth is able to do.' This cannot be seen as simple shortening, given his full citations of *Mark* in every other section.

Furthermore, the difference in prepositions and case must be considered to be a significant difference in translating ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. The versatility of ἐπὶ and its tendency by the time of Koine to absorb the roles of other prepositions might explain its varied treatment.<sup>17</sup> Above, in our discussion on the *Comm. Matt.* we discussed this sort of variability and its use in identifying unique strands of authorship. According to Nigel Turner, this usage of ἐπὶ plus a genitive suggests 'upon.'<sup>18</sup> Then, Jerome's text makes a most sensible choice with *in terra*. The Vulgate, going by Plater and White, uses *super* with the accusative to suggest something is 'over, upon...expressing authority over.'<sup>19</sup> Plater and White suggest *super firmamentum* of Genesis 1:7, *super lapidem* of *Matthew*

<sup>17</sup> J.H. Moulton and W.F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 2 (1929) 312.

<sup>18</sup> N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 3 *Syntax*, (1963) 271. Turner cites an identical Mark 2:10 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς as evidence for 'upon.'

<sup>19</sup> Plater and White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate*, (1926) 89.

24:2, and *super crucem* of John 19:19 as evidence of this usage. In each of these examples the force suggests that something is above and beyond its accusative. In Vulgate *Mark* 9:2, a more appropriate translation must be something closer to Latin *apud* or French 'chez,' and I have suggested above that the editor meant to convey that the clothe-fuller was upon and *of* the earth, not above and upon – a choice which would make very little sense. Regardless, the *HM* usage of *in* + ablative is a surely more direct approach. However, the somewhat strange usage of *super* in the Vulgate cannot be considered to be original to its editor. *Codex Veronensis* provides the same as the Vulgate in *super terram*, and I would suggest that the Vulgate editor must have been familiar with this precedent in his rendering as independently occurring similarity is unlikely.

The *Vetus Latina* as presented by Jülicher (here at *Mark* 9:3) is demonstrative of how muddled an attempt at a harmonious Old Latin tradition can become. While he notes *fullo super terram* to be available in *aur c f ff<sup>2</sup> [i]* and *l*, the remainder of the sentence is an agglomeration of individual differences. Essentially, however, these variations are trivial with the word order and presentation of the word *candida* primarily at fault. However, for all of that variation there is little to emphasize in similarity to our focus on the text of Jerome. That is to say, I have not found a *Vetus Latina* source that prefers *in terra* nor one that forgoes some description of the brilliant white colour. I am attracted by the possibility that in this instance Jerome's corrective editorial pen is apparent, but fear falling into the trap of ascribing something to Jerome based only on subjective judgment of superior Latinity. It is, in any case, possible to contextualise Jerome's difference in view of the early *Vercellensis* (*a*); *a* does not add further description after *uelut nix*, and thus lacks this entire descriptive section until it resumes at 9:4 in Jülicher's edition. There rests, then, a small but significantly more honest possibility than the Latinity argument that Jerome was working from an *a*-like

translation of *Mark* and thus was presented with the opportunity for a fully unique interpretation of the Greek.

### Mark 9:5, *Tractatus* 6.73

Non enim <b>sciebant quid</b> <b>loquerentur</b> , erant enim timore <b>perterriti</b> .	Non enim <b>sciebat quid diceret</b> erant enim timore <b>exterriti</b>
--	--

A number of significant differences are found in this instance between the sixth homily of the *HM* and the expected Vulgate. The first to discuss is found in the treatment of the phrase οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῆ, for which we have *HM sciebant quid loquerentur* and the Vulgate *sciebat quid diceret*. This line comes after Peter's offer to set up three dwellings for the transfigured Christ, and the apparitions of Elijah and Moses. The *CM*'s plural *sciebant* and *loquerentur* frames the onlooking Peter as well as James and John as those who 'did not know what they should say.' Jerome's choice of a plural *sciebant* for the singular ᾔδει and plural *loquerentur* for the singular ἀποκριθῆ is less accurate than the Vulgate singular choices. The lexical difference between *loquor* and *dico* does not have great significance in meaning, but does demonstrate a divergence in renderings.

When extra-Hieronymian readings are considered, examples of all lexical variations can be demonstrated. *Vetus Latina* texts including our critically important *ab* provide contradictory evidence. *Vercellensis* compounds *non scieba(n)t* into *nesciebat* and chooses Jerome's *loqueretur*. *Veronensis* reads exactly like the Vulgate with *non enim sciebat quid diceret*. For the shift from *diceret* to *loquere(n)tur*, Jülicher suggests a

number of examples. Other than *a* as noted above, he lists *c ff<sup>2</sup> n q* for *loqueretur*, with a marginal notation of *loquerentur* in *ff<sup>2</sup>*, and *loquebatur* in *d*. Upon examination, Jerome's choice seems the most sensibly early preference in *Vetus Latina* MSS that he would have had access to, and the Vulgate choice seems to be a separate development.

In further patristic evidence, Ambrose provides closer evidence for the Vulgate reading in his somewhat paraphrased *denique ipse Petrus nesciebat quid diceret* (*Exp. Psalmi* 45.2). Where traces of Jerome's text can be found in *Vetus Latina* MSS, his choice to pluralise his verbs and shift the actors to all disciples present seems to be unique.

The second difference is lexical and is found in the Greek ἐκφοβοῖ γὰρ ἐγένοντο. The *HM perterriti* suggests being 'frightened throughout', whereas the Vulgate's *exterriti* suggests a 'sudden feeling of being struck with fear'. Again, *Vetus Latina a b* offer different options. *Vercellensis* suggests *timore enim [reple]ti sunt*, choosing a perfect tense *[reple]ti sunt* in place of both Jerome's and the Vulgate's pluperfect in *erant*. Gasquet proposes *repleti* for the lacuna, but the evidence of *ti* leaves the possibility of both *exterriti* and *perterriti* and thus does not offer much illustrative evidence in this case. *Veronensis* here agrees with Jerome with *timore enim perterriti erant*, where in the paragraph above it agreed with the Vulgate.

The conclusion can only be that Jerome did not directly use the Vulgate's combination of available translational choices. While Jerome's individual choices were not his innovations, perhaps save for his pluralisation of the verbs, his combination is noticeably different than the Vulgate's. This section serves as a strong example of situations in which *Vetus Latina*, the Vulgate, Jerome, and further Patristic evidence may appear to be essentially the same, but upon a closer inspection demonstrates significant historical strains of differences.

**Mark 11:14 *dicit* v. *dixit* and *manducabit* v. *manducet*, *Tractatus* 8.139**

<b>Dicit</b> ei <b>Dominus</b> : Iam non	<b>Et respondens dixit</b> ei: iam
amplius in aeternum quicquam	non amplius in aeternum
ex te fructum <b>manducabit</b>	quisquam fructum ex te
	<b>manducet</b>

This section of the eighth homily presents two identifiable variations between the two texts: the way in which Christ's speech is initiated, and the tense and mood of the final verb *manducare*.

In the first issue the two texts disagree in their rendering of Greek καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῇ. The Vulgate is clearly the most accurate treatment of the Greek in rendering each word directly and sequentially. I initially assumed that Jerome's shorter and more direct approach could be explained by the homiletic nature of the text in which it was used, i.e. '[so] the Lord says to it.' However, *Vetus Latina* tradition seems to indicate that something more akin to this was used before the Vulgate. Both *Codices Vercellensis* and *Veronensis* have *qui dixit ei*. While Jerome's tense is present and he substitutes *Dominus* for the preposition *qui*, the same basic structure is found and both *a b* and Jerome in the *HM* choose to ignore ἀποκριθεὶς. The reason for this might simply be due to its pleonastic redundancy. No matter the specific reason, there is no evidence to suggest that Jerome favoured the choice presented in the Vulgate.<sup>20</sup>

A more significant variation is found in *manducabit* and *manducet*. The latter, Vulgate choice, is a maintenance from the *Vetus Latina*. The sole significant variation I am aware of is in *a*, which chooses *edat* (c.f. *Mark* 8:1-2 above where *a* similarly replaces *manducare* with *edere*). Thus, Jerome's *manducabit* is future in tense and indicative in mood, whereas the traditional form *manducet*, as found in the *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate alike, is present in tense and subjunctive in mood. The Greek word at

<sup>20</sup> Jerome refers to this story in *In Hieremiam* 3.73.5, albeit as paraphrase and without any helpful evidence.

question is φάγοι, an optative aorist. The traditional *manducet* in the subjunctive thus seems appropriate, whereas Jerome's future is perhaps less directly a continuation of the optative force. Given the peculiarity of the choice found in the *HM*, both in view of its precedent Greek and its uniqueness in the field of *Vetus Latina* options, I believe this difference (*manducabit*) to have been sourced in proximity to Jerome.

### Mark 11:16 *dimittebat* v. *sinebat*, *Tractatus* 11.84

Et non <b>dimittebat ut deferrent</b> <b>quodquam uas</b> per Templum	Et non <b>sinebat ut quisquam uas</b> <b>transferret</b> per Templum
--	---

The differences presented between the *CM* and the Vulgate are more significant than the lexical difference suggested in this subsections title. I find the entirety of the two sections shown in bold to be rather significantly different. The reason for my shorter introduction on the basis of *dimittebat* v *sinebat* is its remarkable similarity with *Matthew* 19:14, as discussed in our chapter on the *CM*. In this section of the *CM*, the reader will recall that Jerome likewise chose *dimitte* in place of a very well established *sinite* in place of Greek ἄφετε. Here again in *Mark* is the same Greek word (ἀφίημι) being considered, this time conjugated as ἤφιεν. Jerome, or Jerome's text of the two Gospels, shows a clear preference for the translation of ἀφίημι as *dimitto*, and thus can be shown to be a consistent translation from *Matthew* to *Mark*.

Extra-Vulgate Latin examples are all in agreement with the Vulgate. Jülicher notes *sinebat* to be without contest. The consistency of the Jerome Gospels to translate the Greek in some form of *dimittere* is striking. The remainder of the differences seen above is additional evidence of the Jerome Gospel text's separation from the Vulgate and the *Vetus Latina* traditions. I have not found a single *Vetus Latina* example that prefers *quodquam* for *quis(/quem)quam* (with *aliquis* found in *a*). Furthermore, Jerome's *deferrent* in place of *transferret* must be unique; Jülicher has *transferret* (*transferre* in *c*) in all of his variations and no indication of Jerome's *deferrent*.

The consistent preference for *dimittere* for ἀφίημι in the Gospel text of Jerome indicates consistent stylistic choices in its translation. The further unique variation found at the end of this line is evidence of a possible unidentified, non-Vulgate, text of *Mark* at use by Jerome.

**Mark 14:3 *unguenti pistici* v. *unguenti nardi spicati*, *Tractatus* 10.51**

Et cum esset Bethaniae in domo	Et cum esset Bethaniae in domo
Simonis leprosi et recumberet, uenit	Simonis leprosi et recumberet, uenit
mulier habens alabastrum unguenti	mulier habens alabastrum unguenti
<b>pistici</b> pretiosi.	<b>nardi spicati</b> pretiosi

In his tenth homily on *Mark*, Jerome discusses the unction of Christ in Bethania found in 14:3-6. In the Greek, we read that a woman approached Christ ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς, which is carried over nearly word-for-word in the Vulgate as *habens alabastrum unguenti nardi spicati pretiosi*. The emphasised two words *nardi spicati* are simply *pistici* in Jerome's homily. Setting aside the omission of *nardi* in the Hieronymian edition, the variable treatment of πιστικῆς deserves further inquiry.

Jerome's choice in *pistici* has some precedent in *Vetus Latina* texts. The bilingual Greek-Latin Codex Bezae (d) provides *habens ampullam nardi pistici praetiosi*, preferring Jerome's choice to that of the Vulgate. So too do *Vetus Latina* *aur f* and *i*, as per Jülicher. Otherwise, the choice of *nardi spicati* certainly seems to be a good *Vetus Latina* (c ff<sup>2</sup> l q) as well as early Vulgate choice, found in Codex Fuldensis (F) and Codex Amiatinus (A). Codex Sangallensis 1395 (Σ) records *nardi* and is cut off leaving a lacuna after *nardi* and before *pretiosi*. Jerome is noticeably adhering to an earlier, pre-Vulgate tradition in his choice of *pistici*. This choice that can be easily



argued as more appropriately Hieronymian given its equivalence to the Greek πιστικῆς, a word the *LSJ* only defines in relation to *Mark* 14:3, and *John* 12:3 as 'liquid.' *Lewis and Short* give a similarly frustratingly narrow definition of *pisticus*, 'pure, genuine' and cites Vulgate *John* 12:3. Indeed, *John* 12:3 carries a near equivalent passage that in the Vulgate agrees with Jerome's choice *pistici* and not its supposedly related Vulgate *Mark*. Leaving aside why the two Vulgate Gospels might disagree, it is clear that the choice in *pistici* aims to directly transliterate a troublesome word in the Greek. Of course this choice must predate Jerome, but it stands that his adoption of this method stands opposed to the different option pursued by the Vulgate in *spicati*. The omission of *nardi* is more troublesome; I have been able to find a clear explanatory pattern of precedents for this choice and must believe it is unique to Jerome or his family of texts.

The Vulgate usage of *nardi spicati* was apparently read as a packaged meaning, making its way into English as *spikenard*. As with its Greek and Latin parents, this word is difficult to define, with the *OED* suggesting a 'A costly perfumed ointment much valued in ancient times; the Himalayan plant of the valerian family that produces the rhizome from which this ointment was prepared; a plant resembling spikenard in fragrance.' The rather singular source for this definition is evident in its given etymology as 'Middle English: from Medieval Latin *spica nardi*.' The powerful influence of the Vulgate on modern language need not be repeated here. However, this lasting influence, in this instance particularly, cannot be ascribed to Jerome.

## Conclusion

Jerome's choices can never be pinned to a single manuscript tradition. The same was also true in our discussion of *Matthew*. For example, in *Mark* 8:1-2, pieces from at least four different identifiable traditions were found collated together in the *HM*. Too

reiterate, the *HM* had chosen to omit *iterum*, as does *q*, yet chose *manducent*, as only in *d*, where *q* and others chose *manducarent*. A recapitulation of the numerous examples demonstrates the variable nature of Jerome's text of *Mark*, and the Gospels as a whole. This can only be explained in one of two ways: either, Jerome had access to a tradition of which we are otherwise unaware, or, we are witnessing the fruit of Jerome's collation of divergent traditions as discussed in his letter to Damasus. The implication is important. While it is easy to look at the massive differences between the work of Jerome and the Vulgate, there is clear evidence that Jerome's text is referential to a number of traditions thereby confirming that he worked at collecting and editing a wide array of existing Latin translations. As in the conclusions provided in the parallel chapter on Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew*, the strongest conclusion is that none can be confidently made. Rather, the text of *Mark* as presented in Jerome's *Homilies* suggests inconsistent witness when held up to our available manuscript traditions. The possibility that Jerome was a witness to a consistent yet otherwise unknown tradition remains. Further discussion on these inconsistencies will be presented in the 'Afterword' to this thesis. The totality of the references in the *Homilies* is also presented in a textual comparison table, to follow.

## Chapter 7

### Text comparisons

**Table 1: Jerome’s Text of *Matthew: Commentary on Matthew***

The following table is the fruit of an intensive study of the text of the entire text of *Matthew* as presented by Jerome in his *Commentary on Matthew*. The first column contains the chapter and verse of the *Matthew* citation (recorded as Chapter:Verse) in the sequence it is presented in the *Commentary*. As such, in the rare occasion verses may appear out of their typical order or may be repeated. The text in the second column is Jerome’s witness as found in his *Commentary* and is largely taken from Emile Bonnard’s two-volume effort for *Sources chrétiennes*.<sup>1</sup> The third column is the Stuttgart edition of the Vulgate, as is the Vulgate text through this thesis.

A number of *sigla* may appear in italics, typically separated, such as *b c ff*<sup>1</sup>. This suggests that the represented manuscripts agree with the variation presented. Some notes may present connected *sigla* as *abd*, *ab*, *bd*, etc. This suggests that the manuscripts listed share the variations that follow. The *sigla* are as follows<sup>6</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> Emile Bonnard, *Commentaire sur S. Matthieu*, Sources Chrétiennes (1977 & 1979).

<sup>6</sup> Metzger, *Early Versions*, (1977) 308-19; Jülicher, *Itala: Matthäus-Evangelium* (1972), VII-VIII; Houghton, *Augustine’s Text of John* (2008) 103-6.

<i>a</i>	Vercellensis, 4 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>aur</i>	Aureus Holmiensis, 8 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>b</i>	Veronensis, 5 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>c</i>	Colbertinus, 12 <sup>th</sup> -13 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>d</i>	Bezae, 5 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>e</i>	Palatinus, 5 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>f</i>	Brixianus, 6 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>ff</i> <sup>1</sup>	Corbeiensis, 8 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>ff</i> <sup>2</sup>	Corbeiensis (8), 5 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>g</i> <sup>1</sup>	Sangermanensis, 8 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>h</i>	Claromontanus, 5 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>k</i>	Bobiensis, 4 <sup>th</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>l</i>	Rehdigeranus, 8 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>n</i>	Sangallensis, 5 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>q</i>	Monacensis, 6 <sup>th</sup> -7 <sup>th</sup> Century
<i>r</i> <sup>1</sup>	Usserianus, 7 <sup>th</sup> Century

Furthermore, the following symbols suggest that crossreferences may be found in the stated tables also found in this dissertation:

‡: Table on Scriptural citations in *Epistle 22*

※: Table on Scriptural citations in the *Commentary on Jeremiah*

	Commentary on Matt.	Stuttgart
1:1	Liber generationis Iesu Christi Filii Daud filii Abraham	Liber generationis Iesu Christi Filii Daud filii Abraham
1:3	Iudas autem genuit Phares et <b>Zaram</b> de Thamar.	Iudas autem genuit Phares et <b>Zara</b> de Thamar.
1:4	Naasson autem genuit Salmon	Naasson autem genuit Salmon.
1:8-9	Ioram autem genuit Oziam, Ozias autem genuit Ioatham.	Ioram autem genuit Oziam, Ozias autem genuit Ioatham.
1:12	Et post transmigrationem Babylonis Iechonias genuit Salathiel.	Et post transmigrationem Babylonis Iechonias genuit Salathiel.
1:16	Iacob autem genuit Ioseph. Genuit Ioseph uirum Mariae.	Iacob autem genuit Ioseph uirum Mariae.
1:17	Et a transmigratione Babylonis usque ad Christum generationes quattuordecim.	Et a transmigratione Babylonis usque ad Christum generationes quattuordecim.
1:18	Christi autem generatio sic erat Cum esset desponsata mater eius Maria. Antequam conuenirent inuenta est in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto.	Christi autem generatio sic erat Cum esset desponsata mater eius Maria. <b>Ioseph</b> antequam conuenirent inuenta est in utero habens de Spiritu Sancto.

1:19	Ioseph autem uir eius, cum esset iustus et nollet eam traducere, uoluit occulte dimittere eam.	Ioseph autem uir eius, cum esset iustus et nollet eam traducere, uoluit occulte dimittere eam.
1:20	Ioseph fili Dauid, noli timere accipere Mariam <b>uxorem</b> tuam.	Ioseph fili Dauid noli timere accipere Mariam <b>coniugem</b> tuam.
1:21	Et uocabis nomen eius Iesum; ipse enim saluum faciet populum suum.	Et uocabis nomen eius Iesum; ipse enim saluum faciet populum suum.
1:22-3	Hoc autem totum factum est ut adimpleretur quod dictum est a Domino per prophetam dicentem: ecce uirgo in utero <b>habebit</b> et pariet. [c.f. 1:18 above]	Hoc autem totum factum est ut adimpleretur id quod dictum est a Domino per prophetam dicentem: ecce uirgo in utero <b>habebit</b> et pariet [ <b>filium</b> ]
1:24-5 <sup>7</sup>	Exsurgens autem Ioseph a somno fecit sicut praecepit ei angelus Domini. Accepit coniugem suam et non <b>cognouit</b> eam donec peperit filium suum primogenitum.	Exsurgens autem Ioseph a somno fecit sicut praecepit ei angelus Domini et accepit coniugem suam. Et non <b>cognoscebat</b> eam donec peperit filium suum primogenitum (vul)
2:2	Uidimus enim stellam eius in oriente.	Uidimus enim stellam eius in oriente.
2:5	At illi dixerunt ei: in Bethleem Iudaeae.	At illi dixerunt ei: in Bethleem Iudaeae.
2:11	Et apertis suis obtulerunt ei munera aurum, Thus et myrram	Et apertis <b>thesauris</b> suis obtulerunt ei munera aurem <b>tus</b> et <b>murram</b>
2:12	Et responso accepto in somnis ne redirent ad Herodem per aliam uiam reuersi sunt in regionem suam.	Et responso accepto in somnis ne redirent ad Herodem per aliam uiam reuersi sunt in regionem suam.
2:13	Ecce angelus Domini apparuit in somnis Ioseph dicens: surge et accipe puerum et matrem eius et fuge in Aegyptum.	Ecce angelus Domini apparuit in somnis Ioseph dicens: surge et accipe puerum et matrem eius et fuge in Aegyptum.
2:15	Ut adimpleretur quod dictum est a Domino per prophetam dicentem: ex Aegypto uocaui filium meum.	Ut adimpleretur quod dictum est a Domino per prophetam dicentem: ex Aegypto uocaui filium meum.
2:17-8? ✕	Tunc adimpletum est quod dictum est per Hieremiam prophetam dicentem: Vox in Rama audita est, ploratus et ululatus multus, Rachel plorans filios suos et noluit consolari quia non sunt	Tunc adimpletum est quod dictum est per Hieremiam prophetam dicentem: Vox in Rama audita est ploratus et ululatus multus, Rachel plorans filios suos et noluit consolari quia non sunt.
2:20	Defuncti sunt qui quaerebant animam pueri	Defuncti sunt <b>enim</b> qui quaerebant animam pueri
2:21	Qui surgens accepit puerum et matrem eius.	Qui surgens accepit puerum et matrem eius.
2:22	Audiens autem quod Archelaus regnaret in Iudea pro Herode patre suo.	Audiens autem quod Archelaus regnaret in Iudaea pro Herode patre suo.
2:23	et ueniens habitauit in ciuitate quae uocatur Nazareth, ut adimpleretur quod dictum est per prophetas: Quoniam nazareus uocabitur.	et ueniens habitauit in ciuitate quae uocatur Nazareth, ut adimpleretur quod dictum est per prophetas: Quoniam Nazareus uocabitur.
3:2	Paenitentiam agite, adpropinquauit enim regnum caelorum.	Paenitentiam agite, adpropinquauit enim regnum caelorum.
3:3	Hic est enim qui dictus est per Esaiam prophetam dicentem: uox clamantis in deserto: parate uiam Domini, rectas facite semitas eius.	Hic est enim qui dictus est per Esaiam prophetam dicentem: uox clamantis in deserto: parate uiam Domini, rectas facite semitas eius.
3:4	Ipse autem Iohannes habebat uestimentum de pilis camelorum et zonam pelliciam circa lumbos suos.	Ipse autem Iohannes habebat uestimentum de pilis camelorum et zonam pelliciam circa lumbos suos

<sup>7</sup> In this section, Jerome writes: Lege supradictum labellum aduersus Heluidium.

3:4	Esca eius locustae et mel silvestre.	Esca <b>autem</b> eius erat locustae et mel silvestre
3:9 <sup>8</sup> ✕	<b>Potens est</b> Deus de lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abrahae. (vul Φ, clem)	Quoniam <b>potest</b> Deus de lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abrahae.
3:10 ✕	<b>Ecce</b> secures ad <b>radicem</b> arborum posita est.	<b>Iam enim</b> securis ad <b>radicem</b> arborum posita est.
3:11	Cuius non sum dignus calciamenta portare. <b>Ille</b> uos baptizabit in Spiritu sancto et igni	Cuius non sum dignus calciamenta portare. <b>Ipse</b> uos baptizabit in Spiritu Sancto et igni
3:13	<b>Iordanem</b> ....baptizaretur	<b>Iordanen</b> ... baptizaretur
3:15	Sine modo sic enim decet <b>implere nos</b> omenem iustitiam	Sine modo sic enim decet <b>nos implere</b> omnem iustitiam
3:16	Aperti sunt ei caeli, et uidit Spiritum descendentem sicut columbam uenientem <b>super se.</b>	Aperti sunt ei caeli, et uidit Spiritum <b>Dei</b> descendentem sicut columbam uenientem <b>super se.</b>
4:1	Tunc ductus est in <b>deserto</b> a Spiritu ut temptaretur a diabolo.	Tunc <b>Iesus</b> ductus est in <b>desertum</b> ab Spiritu ut temptaretur a diabolo
4:2	Et cum ieiunasset quadraginta diebus et quadraginta noctibus postea esuriit	Et cum ieiunasset quadraginta diebus et quadraginta noctibus postea esuriit.
4:3	Panes fiant	Panes fiant
4:4	Qui respondens <b>ait</b> : Scriptum est: Non in pane solo <b>uiuit</b> homo, sed in omni uerbo quod procedit de ore Dei. (still common Greek)	Qui respondens <b>dixit</b> : Scriptum est: Non in pane solo <b>uiuet</b> homo, sed in omni uerbo quod procedit de ore Dei.
4:5	Tunc <b>adsumpsit</b> eum diabolus in sanctam ciuitatem Statuit eum <b>super pinnam</b> templi [ZPDc]	tunc <b>adsumit</b> eum diabolus in sanctam ciuitatem et statuit eum <b>supra pinnaculum</b> temple
4:6 <sup>9</sup>	Si filius Dei es, mitte te deorsum ... Angelis suis mandauit de te, <b>ut</b> in manibus <b>tollant</b> te, ne forte offendas ad lapidem pedem tuum	Si Filius Dei es, mitte te deorsum Angelis suis mandabit de te, <b>et</b> in manibus <b>tollent</b> te ne forte offendas ad lapidem pedem tuum
4:7	Ait illi Iesus: Rursum scriptum est: Non temptabis Dominum Deum tuum	Ait illi Iesus: Rursum scriptum est: non temptabis Dominum Deum tuum.
4:8	Iterum adsumit eum diabolus in montem <b>excelsum</b> ualde et ostendit ei omnia regna mundi et gloriam eorum.	Iterum adsumit eum diabolus in montem <b>excelsum</b> ualde et ostendit ei omnia regna mundi et gloriam eorum.
4:9	Haec omnia dabo tibi <sup>1</sup> , si cadens adoraueris me.  <sup>1</sup> : unique order	<b>Haec tibi omnia dabo</b> , si cadens adoraueris me.
4:10	Tunc <b>dixit</b> ei Iesus: Uade Satanas; scriptum est: Dominum Deum tuum adorabis et illi soli seruies.	Tunc <b>dicit</b> ei Iesus: Uade Satanas; scriptum est: Dominum Deum tuum adorabis et illi soli seruies.
4:11	Tunc reliquit eum diabolus, et <b>accesserunt angeli</b> et ministrabant ei.	Tunc reliquit eum diabolus, et ecce <b>angeli accesserunt</b> et ministrabant ei.
4:15	Terra Zabulon et terra <b>Neptalim</b>	Terra Zabulon et terra <b>Nephtalim</b>

<sup>8</sup> Ambrose, Expositio psalmi XCVIII: potens enim deus est de lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abrahae

<sup>9</sup> Psalm 90. Vulgate: in manibus portabunt te, ne forte offendant ad lapidem pes tuus.

4:17	Exinde coepit Iesus praedicare et dicere: Paenitentiam agite, adpropinquauit enim regnum caelorum	Exinde coepit Iesus praedicare et dicere: Paenitentiam agite, adpropinquauit enim regnum caelorum
4:19 ✕	Uenite post me, et faciam uos fieri piscatores hominum.	Uenite post me, et faciam uos fieri piscatores hominum.
4:24	Et lunaticos et paralyticos et curauit eos.	Et lunaticos et paralyticos et curauit eos.
5:1	Uidens autem turbas ascendit in montem et cum sedisset accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius.	Uidens autem turbas ascendit in montem et cum sedisset accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius.
5:3	Beati pauperes spiritu.	Beati pauperes spiritu.
5:4	Beati mites quoniam ipsi possidebunt terram.	Beati mites quoniam ipsi possidebunt terram.
5:5 ✕	Beati qui lugent quoniam ipsi consolabuntur.	Beati qui lugent quoniam ipsi consolabuntur.
5:6	Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt iustiam.	Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt iustitiam.
5:7	Beati misericordes.	Beati misericordes.
5:8	Beati mundo corde quoniam ipsi Deum uidebunt.	Beati mundo corde quoniam ipsi Deum uidebunt.
5:9	Beati pacifici.	Beati pacifici.
5:10	Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam.	Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam.
5:11	Beati estis cum maledixerint uobis et persecuti uos fuerint et dixerint omne malum aduersum uos mentientes	Beati estis cum maledixerint uobis et persecuti uos fuerint et dixerint omne malum aduersum uos mentientes (propter me)
5:12	Gaudete et exultate.	Gaudete et exultate.
5:13	Uos estis sal terrae, Quod si sal euauerit, in quo <b>saliatur</b> Ad nihilum ualet ultra nisi ut mittatur foras et conculcetur ab hominibus.	Uos estis sal terrae, Quod si sal euauerit, in quo <b>sallietur</b> ad nihilum ualet ultra nisi ut mittatur foras et conculcetur ab hominibus.
5: 14-5 ✕	Uos estis lux mundi. Non potest ciuitas abscondi supra montem posita, neque accedunt lucernam et ponunt eam sub modio.	Uos estis lux mundi. Non potest ciuitas abscondi supra montem posita, neque accendunt lucernam et ponunt eam sub modio.
5:17	Nolite putare quoniam ueni soluere legem aut prophetas; non ueni soluere sed adimplere.	Nolite putare quoniam ueni soluere legem aut prophetas; non ueni soluere sed adimplere.
5:18	Donec transeat caelum et terra Iota unum aut unus apex non praeteribit <b>ex</b> lege donec omnia fiant.	Donec transeat caelum et terra Iota unum aut unus apex non praeteribit <b>a</b> lege donec omnia fiant.
5:19	Qui soluerit unum de mandatis istis minimis et docuerit sic homines, minimus uocabitur in regno caelorum; qui autem fecerit et docuerit magnus uocabitur in regno caelorum	Qui <b>ergo</b> soluerit unum de mandatis istis minimis et docuerit sic homines, minimus uocabitur in regno caelorum; qui autem fecerit et docuerit <b>hic</b> magnus uocabitur in regno caelorum.
5:22	Omnis qui irascitur fratri suo Qui autem dixerit fratri suo: Racha Qui autem dixerit: Fatue, reus erit gahennae	Omnis qui irascitur fratri suo Qui autem dixerit fratri suo: Racha Qui autem dixerit: Fatue, reus erit gehennae.
5:23	Si ergo <b>offers</b> munus tuum ad altare et ibi recordatus fueris quia frater tuus habet aliquid aduersum te <b>[Clem]</b>	Si ergo <b>offerres</b> munus tuum ad altare et ibi recordatus fueris quia frater tuus habet aliquid aduersum te
5:25-6	Esto consentiens aduersario tuo cito, dum es <b>cum illo in uia</b> [Ep. 127.3], ne forte tradat te aduersarius iudici et iudex tradat te ministro et in carcerem mittaris. Amen dico tibi: non exies inde donec reddas nouissimum quadrantem.	Esto consentiens aduersario tuo cito, dum es <b>in uia cum eo</b> ne forte tradat te aduersarius iudici et iudex tradat te ministro et in carcerem mittaris. Amen dico tibi: non exies inde donec reddas nouissimum quadrantem. [solid vul]

5:28 ‡	Qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam, iam moechatus est eam in corde suo. [Ep. 125.7]	Qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam, iam moechatus est eam in corde suo.
5:29	Quod si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat te.	Quod si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat te.
5:31-2	Dictum est: Quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam, det illi libellum repudii <sup>1</sup> ; ego autem dico uobis {quia omnis} <sup>2</sup> qui <sup>3</sup> dimiserit uxorem suam.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c fff<sup>1</sup> l</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur c fff<sup>1</sup> l</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup> l</i>	Dictum est <b>autem</b> : Quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam, det illi libellum repudii; ego autem dico uobis quia omnis qui dimiserit uxorem suam.
5:34	Ego autem dico uobis non iurare omnino neque per caelum.	Ego autem dico vobis non iurare omnino neque per caelum.
5:38-9	Audistis quia dictum est: Oculum pro oculo, dentem pro dente; ego autem dico uobis non resistere malo.	Audistis quia dictum est: Oculum pro oculo, et dentem pro dente; ego autem dico uobis non resistere malo.
5:39-40	Si quis te percusserit in <b>dextra</b> maxilla tua, praebe illi alteram; et <b>illi</b> qui uult tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam tollere, remitte ei et pallium.	Si quis te percusserit in <b>dextera</b> maxilla tua, praebe illi <b>et</b> alteram; et <b>ei</b> qui uult tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam tollere, remitte ei et pallium.
5:42	Qui petit a te da ei, et uolenti mutuari a te ne auertaris.	Qui petit a te da ei, et uolenti mutuari a te ne auertaris.
5:44	Ego autem dico uobis: Diligite inimicos uestros, benefacite his qui oderunt uos.	Ego autem dico uobis: {Diligite inimicos uestros,} benefacite his qui oderunt uos.
5:45	Ut sitis filii Patris uestri qui in caelis est.	Ut sitis filii Patris Uestri qui in caelis est.
6:2	Cum ergo <b>facis elemosinam</b> , noli tuba canere ante te sicut hypocritae faciunt in synagogis et in uicis, ut honorificentur ab hominibus.	cum ergo <b>facies elemosynam</b> noli tuba canere ante te sicut hypocritae faciunt in synagogis et in uicis ut honorificentur ab hominibus.
6:3	Te autem faciente <b>elemosinam</b> , nesciat sinistra tua quid faciat dextra tua.	Te autem faciente <b>elemosynam</b> , nesciat sinistra tua quid faciat dextera tua.
6:5	Amen dico uobis: Receperunt mercedem suam.	Amen dico uobis: Receperunt mercedem suam.
6:6	Tu autem cum orabis, intra in cubiculum tuum et <b>clausum tuum</b> <sup>1</sup> et <b>clauso</b> ostio tuo ora <b>Patre, tuum</b> in abscondito  <sup>1</sup> : unique addition	Tu autem cum orabis, intra in cubiculum tuum et <b>cluso</b> ostio tuo [ <i>om. tuo: ZGclem</i> ] ora <b>Patrem tuum</b> in abscondito [ <i>absconso sMGD</i> ]
6:7	Orantes autem nolite multum loqui sicut ethnici	Orantes autem nolite multum loqui sicut ethnici.
6:8	Scit enim Pater uester quid opus sit uobis ante quam petatis	Scit enim Pater uester quibus opus sit uobis antequam petatis.
6:9	Pater noster qui in caelis es Santificetur nomen tuum.	Pater noster qui in caelis es Sanctificetur nomen tuum.
6:10	Ueniat regnum tuum  Fiat uoluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra.	Ueniat regnum tuum  Fiat uoluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra.



6:11	Panem nostrum <b>supersubstantialem</b> da nobis hodie	panem nostrum <b>supersubstantialem</b> da nobis hodie. [ <i>cotidianum</i> Sangal <i>marginis</i> ; (G)C]
6:13	Amen	N/A
6:14	Si enim dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum	Si enim dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum.
6:16	<b>Exterminant</b> <sup>1</sup> enim facies suas ut pareant hominibus ieiunantes.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i> ; >exterminantes, <i>c</i>	<b>Demoliuntur</b> enim facies suas ut pareant hominibus ieiunantes.
6:17	Tu autem cum ieiunas, ungue caput tuum et faciem tuam laua.	Tu autem cum ieiunas, ungue caput tuum et faciem tuam laua.
6:21 ‡	Ubi {} <sup>1</sup> est thesaurus tuus, ibi est et cor tuum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. enim, unique</i>	Ubi <b>enim</b> est thesaurus tuus, ibi est et cor tuum.
6:22	Si oculus tuus simplex <b>est</b> , totum corpus tuum lucidum erit.	Si <b>fuerit</b> oculus tuus simplex, totum corpus tuum lucidum erit. ( <b>F</b> )
6:23	{Si ergo lumen quod in te est tenebrae sunt}, <b>ipsae</b> tenebrae quantae erunt?	{Si ergo lumen quod in te est tenebrae}, * <sup>1</sup> sunt tenebrae quantae erunt?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. ipsae, c</i>
6:24 ‡	Non potestis Deo seruire et <b>mammonae</b> .	Non potestis Deo seruire et <b>mamonae</b> .
6:25 ‡	Ne solliciti sitis animae uestrae quid manducetis neque corpori uestro quid induamini.  Nonne anima plus est quam esca et corpus plus est quam uestimentum?	Ne solliciti sitis animae uestrae quid manducetis neque corpori uestro quid induamini.  Nonne anima plus est quam esca et corpus plus est quam uestimentum?
6:26 ‡	Respicite uolatilia caeli quoniam non serunt neque metunt neque congregant in horrea <b>sua</b> <sup>1</sup> , et Pater uester caelestis pascit <b>ea</b> <sup>1</sup> . Nonne uos pluris <sup>3</sup> estis illis?  <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : unique <sup>3</sup> : <i>om. magis</i> ] >pluris, <i>c</i>	Respicite uolatilia caeli quoniam non serunt neque metunt neque congregant in horrea, et Pater uester caelestis pascit <b>illa</b> <sup>2</sup> . Nonne uos <b>magis</b> pluris estis illis?  <sup>2</sup> : <i>cet.</i>
6:27-8 ‡	Quis uestrum <b>potest adicere</b> ad staturam suam cubitum unum?  Considerate lilia agri quomodo crescunt.	Quis <b>autem</b> uestrum <b>cogitans potest adicere</b> ad staturam suam cubitum unum? (et de vestimento quid solliciti estis)  Considerate lilia agri quomodo crescunt.
6:34	Nolite solliciti <b>esse de crastino</b> .  Sufficit diei malitia sua	Nolite <b>ergo esse</b> solliciti <b>in crastinum</b> . (crastinus enim dies sollicitus erit sibi ipse) Sufficit diei malitia sua.
7:1	Nolite iudicare ut non iudicemini.	Nolite iudicare ut non iudicemini.
7:3	Quid autem uides <b>fistucam</b> in oculo fratris tui et trabem in oculo tuo non uides.	Quid autem uides <b>festucam</b> in oculo fratris tui et trabem in oculo tuo non uides.
7:6 ✕	Nolite dare sanctum canibus.  Neque mittatis margaritas uestras ante porcos.	Nolite dare sanctum canibus.  Neque mittatis margaritas uestras ante porcos.

7:7 ✕	Petite et dabitur uobis, quaerite et inuenietis, pulsate et aperietur uobis.	Petite et dabitur uobis, quaerite et inuenietis, pulsate et aperietur uobis.
7:11	Si ergo uos cum sitis mali, nostis bona dare filiis uestris.	Si ergo uos cum sitis mali, nostis bona dare filiis uestris.
7:13-4 ‡ ✕	Intrate per angustam portam; <b>quam</b> lata porta et spatiosa uia quae ducit ad perditionem, et multi sunt qui intrant per eam; quam angusta porta et arta uia quae ducit ad uitam, et pauci sunt qui inueniunt eam.	Intrate per angustam portam; <b>quia</b> lata porta et spatiosa uia quae ducit ad perditionem; et multi sunt qui intrant per eam; quam angusta porta et arta uia quae ducit ad uitam, et pauci sunt qui inueniunt eam.
7:15	Adtendite a falsis prophetis qui ueniunt ad uos in <b>uestitu</b> ouium, <b>intus</b> autem sunt lupi rapaces.	Adtendite a falsis prophetis qui ueniunt ad uos in <b>uestimentis</b> ouium, <b>intrinsecus</b> autem sunt lupi rapaces
7:18	Non potest arbor bona fructus malos facere neque arbor mala fructus bonos facere.	Non potest arbor bona fructus malos facere neque arbor mala fructus bonos facere.
7:21	Non omnis qui dicit mihi: Domine, Domine, intrabit in regnum caelorum, sed qui facit uoluntatem Patris mei qui in caelis est.	Non omnis qui dicit mihi: Domine Domine, intrabit in regnum caelorum, sed qui facit uoluntatem Patris mei qui in caelis est.
7:22-3	Multi dicent mihi in illa die: Domine, Domine, nonne in nomine tuo prophetauimus et in nomine tuo daemonia eiecimus et in nomine tuo uirtutes multas fecimus? Et tunc confitebor illis: Quia numquam noui uos; discedite a me qui operamini iniquitatem.	Multi dicent mihi in illa die: Domine, Domine, nonne in nomine tuo prophetauimus et in tuo nomine {daemonia eiecimus et in tuo nomine uirtutes multas fecimus}? Et tunc confitebor illis: Quia numquam noui uos; discedite a me qui operamini iniquitatem.
7:25	Et descendit pluuiua, et uenerunt flumina, et flauerunt uenti  Et non cecidit; fundata enim erat supra petram.	Et <b>(1)</b> descendit pluuiua, et <b>(2)</b> uenerunt flumina, et <b>(3)</b> flauerunt uenti.  Et non cecidit; fundata enim erat super petram.
7:26	Qui aedificauit domum suam <b>super</b> harenam.	Qui aedificauit domum suam <b>supra</b> harenam.
7:29	Erat <b>autem</b> <sup>1</sup> docens eos <b>ut</b> <sup>2</sup> potestatem habens, non <b>ut</b> <sup>3</sup> scribae  <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : unique <sup>3</sup> : unique	Erat <b>enim</b> docens eos <b>sicut (1)</b> potestatem habens, non <b>sicut (2)</b> scribae.
8:1	Cum autem descendisset de monte, secutae sunt eum turbae multae. Et ecce leprosus ueniens adorabat eum.  Domine, si uis, potes me mundare.	Cum autem descendisset de monte, secutae sunt eum turbae multae. Et ecce leprosus ueniens adorabat eum. <b>Dicens</b> :  Domine, si uis, potes me mundare.
8:3	Et extendens manum <b>Iesus</b> tetigit eum dicens, uolo, mundare.	Et extendens manum tetigit eum <b>Iesus</b> dicens, uolo, mundare.
8:4	Et ait illi Iesus: Uide nemini dixeris  Sed uade, ostende te sacerdoti et offer munus quod praecepit <b>Moyse</b> s in testimonium illis.	Et ait illi Iesus: Uide nemini dixeris  Sed uade, ostende te sacerdoti et offer munus quod praecepit <b>Moses</b> in testimonium illis.
8:5-7	Accessit ad eum centurio rogans et dicens: Domine, puer meus iacet in domo paralyticus et male torquetur. Et ait illi Iesus: Ego ueniam et <b>sanabo</b> eum	Accessit ad eum centurio rogans eum et dicens: Domine, puer meus iacet in domo paralyticus et male torquetur. Et ait illi Iesus: ego veniam et <b>curabo</b> eum ( <i>F</i> )

8:9	Ecce ego, <b>cum sim homo</b> , dico huic: uade, et uadit	<b>Nam et ego, homo sum sub potestate habens sub me milites et</b> dico huic: uade, et uadit
8:10	Audiens autem Iesus miratus est.  Amen dico uobis: non inueni tantam fidem in Israhel.	Audiens autem Iesus miratus est.  Amen dico uobis: non inueni tantam fidem in Israhel.
8:11	Multi ab oriente et occidente uenient et recumbent cum Abraham et Isaac et Iacob in regno caelorum.	Multi ab oriente et occidente uenient et recumbent cum Abraham et Isaac et Iacob in regno caelorum.
8:12	Filii autem regni  Eicientur in tenebras exteriores  Ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium	Filii autem regni  Eicientur in tenebras exteriores  Ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium
8:14-5	Cum uenisset Iesus in domum Petri, uidit socrum eius iacentem et <b>febrientem</b> <sup>1</sup> , et tetigit manum eius, et dimisit eam febris, et surrexit et ministrabat eis.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Et cum uenisset Iesus in domum Petri, uidit socrum eius iacentem et <b>febricitantem</b> <sup>1</sup> , et tetigit manum eius et dimisit eam febris, et surrexit et ministrabat eis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>cet.</i>
8:16	Uespere autem facto, obtulerunt ei multos daemonia habentes, et eiciebat spiritus uerbo et omnes male habentes <b>curabat</b> <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Uespere autem facto, obtulerunt ei multos daemonia habentes, et eiciebat spiritus uerbo et omnes male habentes <b>curauit</b> <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>cet.</i>
8:19-20 ‡	Et accedens unus scriba ait illi: Magister, sequar te quocumque ieris. Et dicit ei Iesus: Uulpes foueas habent et uolucres caeli <b>nidos</b> , filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet. [Ep. 14.6]	Et accedens unus scriba ait illi: Magister, sequar te quocumque ieris. Et dicit ei Iesus: Uulpes foueas habent et uolucres caeli <b>tabernacula</b> , Filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet.
8:21	Alius autem de discipulis eius ait illi: Domine, permitte me primum ire et sepelire patrem meum.	Alius autem de discipulis eius ait illi: Domine, permitte me primum ire et sepelire patrem meum.
8:22	Ait Iesus: Sequere me et dimitte mortuos sepelire mortuos suos.	<b>Iesus autem ait illi:</b> Sequere me et dimitte mortuos sepelire mortuos suos.
8:23	Et ascendente eo in nauicula secuti sunt eum discipuli eius	Et ascendente eo in nauicula secuti sunt eum discipuli eius.
8:24-5	Ipse uero dormiebat. Et accesserunt et suscitauerunt eum dicentes: Domine salua nos.	Ipse uero dormiebat. Et accesserunt et suscitauerunt eum dicentes: Domine salua nos <b>perimus</b> .
8:26	Tunc surgens <b>increpauit uentis</b> et mari.	Tunc surgens <b>imperauit uentis</b> et mari.
8:27	Porro homines mirati sunt discentes: Qualis est hic quia uenti et mare oboediunt ei.	Porro homines mirati sunt dicentes: Qualis est hic quia <b>et</b> uenti et mare oboediunt ei.
8:29	Quid nobis et tibi, fili Dei? Uenisti huc ante tempus torquere nos?	Quid nobis et tibi, Fili Dei? Uenisti huc ante tempus torquere nos?
8:31	Si eicis nos, mitte nos in gregem porcorum. Et ait illis: Ite.	Si eicis nos, mitte nos in gregem porcorum. Et ait illis: Ite.
8:34	Et ecce <b>omnis</b> <sup>1</sup> ciuitas exiit obuiam Iesu, et uiso eo rogabant ut transiret a finibus eorum.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Et ecce <b>tota</b> ciuitas exiit obuiam Iesu, et uiso eo rogabant ut transiret a finibus eorum.

9:1-2	Et uenit in ciuitatem suam. Et ecce offerebant ei paralyticum iacentem in lecto. <b>Uidens autem</b> Iesus fidem illorum dixit paralytico: Confide, fili, remittuntur tibi peccata tua.	Et uenit in ciuitatem suam. Et ecce offerebant ei paralyticum iacentem in lecto. <b>Et uidens</b> Iesus fidem illorum dixit paralytico: Confide, fili, remittuntur tibi peccata tua.
9:3	Et ecce quidam de scribis dixerunt intra se: Hic blasphemat.	Et ecce quidam de scribis dixerunt intra se: hic blasphemat.
9:5	Quid est facilius dicere: Dimittuntur tibi peccata <b>tua</b> ; aut dicere: Surge et ambula?	Quid est facilius dicere: Dimittuntur tibi peccata; aut dicere: surge et ambula?
9:6	Tolle lectum tuum et uade in domum tuam.	Tolle lectum tuum et uade in domum tuam.
9:9	Et cum transiret inde Iesus, uidit hominem sedentem in teloneo Mattheum nomine et ait illi: Sequere me. Et surgens secutus est eum.	Et cum transiret inde Iesus, uidit hominem sedentem in teloneo Mattheum nomine et ait illi: Sequere me. Et surgens secutus est eum.
9:10	Et factum est discumbente eo in domo ecce multi publicani et peccatores uenientes discumbebant cum Iesu.	Et factum est discumbente eo in domo ecce multi publicani et peccatores uenientes discumbebant cum Iesu.
9:13	Misericordiam uolo et non sacrificium.	Misericordiam uolo et non sacrificium.
9:14	Tunc accesserunt ad eum discipuli Iohannis discentes: Quare nos et Pharisei ieiuamus frequentur, discipuli autem tui non ieiuant?	Tunc accesserunt ad eum discipuli Iohannis dicentes: Quare nos et Pharisei ieiuamus frequenter, discipuli autem tui non ieiuant?
9:15	Ait illis Iesus: Numquid possunt filii sponsi lugere quamdiu cum illis est sponsus? Uenient autem dies cum auferetur ab eis sponsus, et tunc ieiuabunt.	Ait illis Iesus: Numquid possunt filii sponsi lugere quamdiu cum illis est sponsus? Uenient autem dies cum auferetur ab eis sponsus, et tunc ieiuabunt.
9:16-7	Nemo <b>mittit</b> commissuram panni ruddis in <b>uestimento ueteri</b> <sup>1</sup> ; tollit enim plenitudinem eius <b>de</b> <sup>2</sup> uestimento, et peior scissura fit. Neque mittunt uinum nouum in utres ueteres, alioquin rumpentur utres, et uinum <b>effundetur</b> et <b>ueteres peribunt</b> ; sed uinum nouum in utres nouos mittunt, et ambo conseruantur.  <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : <i>d</i>	Nemo <b>autem inmittit</b> commissuram panni rudis in <b>uestimentum uetus</b> tollit enim plenitudinem eius <b>a</b> uestimento et peior scissura fit. Neque mittunt uinum nouum in utres ueteres alioquin rumpuntur utres, et uinum <b>effunditur</b> , et <b>utres pereunt</b> sed uinum nouum in utres nouos mittunt, et ambo conseruantur.
9:18-9	Ecce princeps unus accessit et adorabat eum dicens: Filia mea modo defuncta est, sed ueni, inpone manum super eam, et uiuet. Et surgens Iesus sequebatur eum et discipuli eius.	ecce princeps unus accessit et adorabat eum dicens: filia mea modo defuncta est, sed ueni, inpone manum super eam, et uiuet. Et surgens Iesus sequebatur eum et discipuli eius.
9:20	Ecce mulier quae sanguinis fluxum patiebatur duodecim annis accessit retro et tetigit fimbriam uestimenti eius.	Ecce mulier quae sanguinis fluxum patiebatur duodecim annis accessit retro et tetigit fimbriam uestimenti eius.
9:21	Dicebat enim intra se: Si tetigero tantum <b>fimbriam uestimenti</b> eius, salua ero.	Dicebat enim intra se: si tetigero tantum <b>uestimentum</b> eius salua ero [vestimenta N]
9:22	Confide, filia, fides tua te saluam fecit.	Confide, filia, fides tua te saluam fecit
9:23	Et cum uenisset Iesus in domum principis et uidisset tibicines et turbam tumultuantem	Et cum uenisset Iesus in domum principis et uidisset tibicines et turbam tumultuantem

9:24	Non est mortua puella sed dormit	Non est <b>enim</b> mortua puella sed dormit.
9:25	Et cum eiecta esset turba intrauit et tenuit manum eius.  [Et tenuit manum eius], et surrexit puella	Et cum eiecta esset turba intrauit et tenuit manum eius  Et surrexit puella
9:27-8	Et transeunte inde Iesu, secuti sunt eum duo caeci clamantes et dicentes: Miserere nostri, fili Daud. Cum autem uenisset domum, accesserunt ad eum caeci  Creditis quia possum hoc facere?  Utique Domine	Et transeunte inde Iesu, secuti sunt eum duo caeci clamantes et dicentes: miserere nostri Fili Daud. Cum autem uenisset domum, accesserunt ad eum caeci  Creditis quia possum hoc facere?  Utique Domine
9:30-1	Et comminatus est illis Iesus dicens: Uidete ne quis sciat. Illi autem exeuntes diffamauerunt eum in tota terra illa.	Et comminatus est illis Iesus dicens: Uidete ne quis sciat. Illi autem exeuntes diffamauerunt eum in tota terra illa.
9:32-3	Egressis autem illis, ecce obtulerunt ei hominem mutum daemonium habentem, et eiecto daemone locutus est mutus.	Egressis autem illis, ecce obtulerunt ei hominem mutum daemonium habentem, et eiecto daemone locutus est mutus.
9:33-4	Et miratae sunt turbae dicentes: Numquam <b>sic apparuit</b> in Israhel. Pharisei autem dicebant: {In principe <b>daemonium</b> eicit <b>daemonia</b> .} <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. in a</i>	Et miratae sunt turbae dicentes: numquam <b>paruit sic</b> in Israhel. Pharisei autem dicebant: {In principe <b>daemoniorum</b> eicit <b>daemones</b> .}
9:35	Et <b>circuibat</b> Iesus ciuitates omnes et castella docens in synagogis eorum et praedicans euangelium regni et curans omnem languorem et omnem infirmitatem.	Et <b>circumibat</b> Iesus ciuitates omnes et castella docens in synagogis eorum et praedicans euangelium regni et curans omnem languorem et omnem infirmitatem.
9:36	Uidens autem turbas, misertus est eis, <b>qui</b> erant uexati et iacentes sicut oues non habentes pastorem.	Uidens autem turbas, misertus est eis, <b>quia</b> erant uexati et iacentes sicut oues non habentes pastorem.
9:37	Messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci.	Messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci
10:1	Et conuocatis duodecim discipulis suis, dedit illis potestatem spirituum immundorum, ut eicerent eos et curarent omnem languorem et omnem infirmitatem.	Et conuocatis duodecim discipulis suis, dedit illis potestatem spirituum immundorum, ut eicerent eos et curarent omnem languorem et omnem infirmitatem.
10:2	Duodecim autem apostolorum nomina sunt haec  Primus Simon qui dicitur Peter et Andreas frater eius	Duodecim autem apostolorum nomina sunt haec  Primus Simon qui dicitur Petrus et Andreas frater eius
10:4	Simon <b>Cananaeus</b>	Simon <b>Cananeus</b>
10:5-6	In uiam gentium ne <b>ambulaueritis</b> et in <b>ciuitates</b> Samaritanorum ne intraueritis, sed potius ite ad oues <b>quae perierunt</b> domus Israhel.	In uiam gentium ne <b>abieritis</b> et in <b>ciuitates</b> Samaritanorum ne intraueritis, sed potius ite ad oues <b>quae perierunt</b> domus Israhel. ( <b>F</b> ) [solid]

10:7-8	Euntes autem praedicate dicentes quia adpropinquauit regnum caelorum; infirmos curate, mortuos suscite, leprosos mundate, daemones eicite; gratis acceptistis, gratis date.	Euntes autem praedicate dicentes quia adpropinquauit regnum caelorum; infirmos curate, mortuos suscite, leprosos mundate, daemones eicite; gratis accepistis, gratis date.
10:9-10	Nolite possidere aurum neque argentum neque pecuniam in zonis uestris, non peram in uia, <b>non</b> duas tunicas, <b>non</b> calciamenta, <b>neque</b> uirgam <b>in manu</b> ; dignus <b>est enim</b> operarius cibo suo.	Nolite possidere aurum neque argentum neque pecuniam in zonis vestris, non peram in uia, <b>neque</b> duas tunicas, <b>neque</b> calciamenta, <b>neque</b> virgam; dignus <b>enim est</b> operarius cibo suo
10:11	In quamcumque ciuitatem aut castellum intraueritis, interrogate quis in ea dignus sit, et ibi manete donec exeatis.	In quamcumque ciuitatem aut castellum intraueritis, interrogate quis in ea dignus sit, et ibi manete donec exeatis.
10:12-3	Intrantes autem in domum salutate eam, et si quidem fuerit domus digna, <b>ueniet</b> pax uestra super eam; <b>sin</b> autem non fuerit digna, pax uestra ad uos reuertetur	Intrantes autem in domum salutate eam, et siquidem fuerit domus digna, <b>ueniat</b> pax uestra super eam; <b>si</b> autem non fuerit digna, pax uestra ad uos reuertatur
10:14	Et quicumque non <b>receperint</b> uos neque <b>audierint</b> sermones uestros, exeuntes foras de domo uel de ciuitate excutite puluerem.	Et quicumque non <b>receperit</b> uos neque <b>audierit</b> sermones uestros, exeuntes foras de domo uel de ciuitate excutite puluerem.
10:15	Amen dico uobis: Tolerabilius erit terrae Sodomorum et Gomorraeorum in die iudicii quam illi ciuitati.	Amen dico vobis: tolerabilius erit terrae Sodomorum et Gomorraeorum in die iudicii quam illi ciuitati.
10:16	Ecce ego mitto uos sicut oues in medio luporum.  Estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes et simplices sicut columbae.	Ecce ego mitto uos sicut oues in medio luporum.  Estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes et simplices sicut columbae.
10:19 10:17 10:18	Cum autem tradent uos, nolite cogitare quomodo aut quid loquamini. (Supra dixerat:) Tradent enim uos in conciliis et in synagogis suis flagellabunt uos, et ad praesides et ad reges ducemini propter me.	Cum autem tradent uos, nolite cogitare quomodo aut quid loquamini. Tradent enim uos in conciliis et in synagogis suis flagellabunt uos, et ad praesides et ad reges ducemini propter me.
10:21	Tradet autem frater fratrem in mortem et pater filium, et insurgent filii in parentes.	Tradet autem frater fratrem in mortem et pater filium, et insurgent filii in parentes.
10:22	Qui perseuerauerit in finem hic saluus erit.	Qui <b>autem</b> perseuerauerit in finem hic saluus erit.
10:23 ✠	Cum autem persequentur uos in ciuitate ista, fugite in aliam. Amen dico uobis: Non consummabitis ciuitates Israhel donec ueniat Filius hominis.	Cum autem persequentur uos in ciuitate ista, fugite in aliam. Amen <b>enim</b> dico uobis: non consummabitis civitates Israhel donec ueniat Filius hominis.
10:25	Si <b>paterfamilias</b> beelzebub uocauerunt, quanto magis domesticos eius.	Si <b>patrem familias</b> Beelzebub uocauerunt, quanto magis domesticos eius.
10:26	Nihil enim opertum est quod non reuelabitur et occultum quod non scietur.	Nihil enim opertum quod non reuelabitur et occultum quod non scietur.
10:27	Quod dico uobis in tenebris dicite in lumine, et quod in aure auditis praedicate super tecta.	Quod dico vobis in tenebris dicite in lumine, et quod in aure auditis praedicate super tecta.

10:28 ✕	Nolite timere eos qui occidunt corpus, animam autem non possunt occidere.  Eum timete qui potest animam et corpus perdere in gehennam.	Nolite timere eos qui occidunt corpus, animam autem non possunt occidere (sed potius)  Eum timete qui potest <b>et</b> animam et corpus perdere in gehennam.
10:29-31	Nonne duo passeress asse ueneunt? Et unus ex illis non cadet super terram sine Patre uestro. Uestri autem et capilli capitis {} <sup>1</sup> numerati sunt. Nolite ergo timere, multis passeribus <b>pluris</b> <sup>1</sup> estis uos. (Lk. 12:7)  <sup>1</sup> : unique <i>om.</i> omnes <sup>2</sup> : unique	Nonne duo passeress asse ueneunt? Et unus ex illis non cadet super terram sine Patre uestro. Uestri autem et capilli capitis <b>omnes</b> numerati sunt. Nolite ergo timere, multis passeribus <b>meliores</b> <sup>2</sup> estis uos.  <sup>2</sup> : <i>a aur b c fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>
10:34	Nolite arbitrari quia uenerim mittere pacem in terram: non ueni pacem mittere sed gladium.	Nolite arbitrari quia uenerim mittere pacem in terram: non ueni pacem mittere sed gladium.
10:35-6 ✕	Ueni enim separare hominem aduersus patrem suum et filiam aduersus matrem suam et nurum aduersus socrum suam, et inimici hominis domestici eius.	Ueni enim separare hominem aduersus patrem suum et filiam aduersus matrem suam et nurum aduersus socrum suam, et inimici hominis domestici eius.
10:37	Qui amat patrem aut matrem plus quam me, non est me dignus.	Qui amat patrem aut matrem plus quam me, non est me dignus.
10:38	Et qui non accipit crucem suam et sequitur me, non est me dignus.	Et qui non accipit crucem suam et sequitur me, non est me dignus.
10:40	Qui recipit uos me recipit, et qui me recipit recipit eum qui me misit.	Qui recipit uos me recipit, et qui me recipit recipit eum qui me misit.
10:41	Qui recipit prophetam in nomine prophetae, mercedem prophetae accipiet.	Qui recipit prophetam in nomine prophetae, mercedem prophetae accipiet.
10:42	Et quicumque potum dederit uni ex minimis istis calicem aquae frigidae tantum in nomine discipuli, amen dico uobis, non perdet mercedem suam.	Et quicumque potum dederit uni ex minimis istis calicem aquae frigidae tantum in nomine discipuli, amen dico uobis, non perdet mercedem suam.
11:2-3	Iohannes autem, cum audisset in uinculis opera Christi, mittens duos de discipulis suis ait illi: Tu es qui uenturus es an alium expectamus?	Iohannes autem, cum audisset in uinculis opera Christi, mittens duos de discipulis suis ait illi: tu es qui uenturus es an alium expectamus?
11:4-5	Respondens Iesus ait illis: Euntes renuntiate Iohanni quae <b>audistis</b> <sup>1</sup> et <b>uidistis</b> <sup>2</sup> : caeci uident, claudi ambulant, leprosoi mundantur, surdi audiunt, mortui resurgunt.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i>	Et respondens Iesus ait illis: Euntes renuntiate Iohanni quae <b>auditis</b> <sup>1</sup> et <b>uidetis</b> <sup>2</sup> : caeci uident, claudi ambulant, leprosi mundantur surdi audiunt mortui resurgunt.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b c d</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>a b c d</i>
11:6	Et beatus est qui non fuerit scandalizatus in me.	Et beatus est qui non fuerit scandalizatus in me.
11:7-8	Illis autem abeuntibus coepit Iesus dicere ad turbas de Iohanne: Quid existis in <b>deserto</b> <sup>1</sup> ? Uidere harundinem uento agitatum? Sed quid existis? Uidere hominem mollibus uestitum?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur g<sup>1</sup> l</i>	Illis autem abeuntibus coepit Iesus dicere ad turbas de Iohanne: Quid existis in <b>desertum</b> <sup>1</sup> ? Uidere harundinem uento agitatum? Sed quid existis? Uidere hominem mollibus uestitum?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b c d fff<sup>1</sup> h q</i>

11:9	Sed quid existis? Uidere prophetam? Etiam dico uobis: Et plus quam prophetam.	Sed quid existis? Uidere prophetam? Etiam dico uobis: Et plus quam prophetam.
11:11	Amen dico uobis: Non surrexit inter natos mulierum maior Iohanne Baptista.  Qui autem minor est in regno caelorum maior est illo.	Amen dico uobis: non surrexit inter natos mulierum maior Iohanne Baptista.  Qui autem minor est in regno caelorum maior est illo.
11:12 ‡	A diebus Iohannis Baptistae usque regnum caelorum uim patitur.	A diebus autem Iohannis Baptistae usque <b>nunc</b> regnum caelorum uim patitur.
11:13	Omnes enim prophetae et lex usque ad Iohannem prophetauerunt.	Omnes enim prophetae et lex usque ad Iohannem prophetauerunt.
11:14-5	Si uultis recipere, ipse est Helias qui uenturus est. Qui habet aures audiendi audiat.	Et si uultis recipere, ipse est Helias qui uenturus est. Qui habet aures audiendi audiat.
11:16-9	Cui autem { <b>adsimilabo</b> } <sup>1</sup> <b>generationem</b> istam? Similis est pueris sedentibus in foro qui clamantes coaequalibus <b>suis</b> <sup>2</sup> dicunt: Cecinimus uobis, et non saltastis, lamentauimus <b>uobis</b> <sup>3</sup> , et non planxistis. Uenit enim Iohannes neque manducans neque bibens, et dicunt: Daemonium habet. Venit Filius hominis manducans et bibens, et dicunt: Ecce homo uorax et <b>uini potator</b> <sup>4</sup> , publicanorum et peccatorum amicus. [Et iustificata est sapientia a filiis suis.]  <sup>1</sup> : <i>f q (d)</i> <sup>2</sup> : unique <sup>3</sup> : <i>a b ff<sup>2</sup> h q</i> <sup>4</sup> : <i>d h</i>	Cui autem { <b>similem aestimabo</b> } <sup>1</sup> generationem istam? Similis est pueris sedentibus in foro qui clamantes coaequalibus dicunt: Cecinimus uobis, et non saltastis lamentauimus, et non planxistis. Uenit enim Iohannes neque manducans neque bibens, et dicunt: Daemonium habet. Uenit Filius hominis manducans et bibens, et dicunt: Ecce homo uorax et <b>potator uini</b> , publicanorum et peccatorum amicus. Et iustificata est sapientia a filiis suis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur c ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l (b)</i>
11:20	Tunc coepit exprobare ciuitatibus in quibus factae sunt plurimae uirtutes eius quia non egissent paenitentiam.	Tunc coepit exprobrare ciuitatibus in quibus factae sunt plurimae uirtutes eius quia non egissent paenitentiam.
11:21-2	Uae tibi Chorazain, uae tibi Bethsaida, quia si in Tyro et Sidone factae essent uirtutes quae factae sunt in uobis, olim in cilicio et cinere paenitentiam egissent. Uerumtamen dico uobis: Tyro et Sidoni remissius erit in die iudicii quam uobis.	Uae tibi Corazain uae tibi Bethsaida quia si in Tyro et Sidone factae essent uirtutes quae factae sunt in uobis, olim in cilicio et cinere paenitentiam egissent. Uerumtamen dico uobis: Tyro et Sidoni remissius erit in die iudicii quam uobis.



11:23	<p>Et tu Capharnaum numquid usque in caelum <b>exaltaueris</b><sup>1</sup>? Usque in infernum descendes?</p> <p>Quia si in Sodomis fuissent uirtutes quae factae sunt in te, forte mansissent usque in hunc diem.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>a</i> (?), or unique</p>	<p>Et tu Capharnaum numquid usque in caelum <b>exaltaberis</b><sup>1</sup>? Usque in infernum descendes?</p> <p>Quia si in Sodomis factae fuissent uirtutes quae factae sunt in te, forte mansissent usque in hunc diem.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>cet.</i></p>
11:25	<p>In illo tempore respondens Iesus dixit: Confiteor tibi Pater Domine caeli et terrae.</p> <p>Quia abscondisti haec a sapientibus et prudentibus et reuelasti ea paruulis.</p>	<p>In illo tempore respondens Iesus dixit: Confiteor tibi Pater Domine caeli et terrae.</p> <p>Quia abscondisti haec a sapientibus et prudentibus et reuelasti ea parvulis.</p>
11:26	<p>Ita Pater quoniam {sic placitum fuit} ante te</p>	<p>Ita Pater quoniam {sic fuit placitum} ante te.</p>
11:27 ✠	<p>Omnia tradita sunt a Patre meo.</p> <p>Et nemo nouit Filium nisi Pater, neque Patrem quis nouit nisi Filius et cui uoluerit Filius reuelare.</p>	<p>Omnia <b>mihi</b> tradita sunt a Patre meo.</p> <p>Et nemo nouit Filium nisi Pater, neque Patrem quis nouit nisi Filius et cui uoluerit Filius reuelare.</p>
11:28	<p>Uenite ad me omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam uos.</p>	<p>Uenite ad me omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam uos.</p>
11:30	<p>Iugum enim meum suaue est et onus meum leue.</p>	<p>Iugum enim meum suaue est et onus meum leue <b>est</b>.</p>
12:1	<p>In illo tempore abiit Iesus sabbato per sata, discipuli autem eius esurientes coeperunt uellere spicas et manducare.</p>	<p>In illo tempore abiit Iesus sabbato per sata, discipuli autem eius esurientes coeperunt uellere spicas et manducare.</p>
12:2	<p>Pharisaei autem uidentes dixerunt ei: Ecce discipuli tui faciunt quod non licet eis facere sabbatis.</p>	<p>Pharisaei autem uidentes dixerunt ei: Ecce discipuli tui faciunt quod non licet eis facere sabbatis.</p>
12:3-4	<p>At ille dixit eis: Non legistis quid fecerit Dauid quando esuriit et qui cum eo erant, quomodo intrauit in domum Dei et panes propositionis comedit quos non licebat ei edere neque his qui cum eo erant nisi solis sacerdotibus.</p>	<p>At ille dixit eis: Non legistis quid fecerit Dauid quando esuriit et qui cum eo erant, quomodo intrauit in domum Dei et panes propositionis comedit quos non licebat ei edere neque his qui cum eo erant nisi solis sacerdotibus.</p>
12:5	<p>Aut non legistis in lege quia sabbatis sacerdotes in templo sabbatum uiolant et sine crimine sunt?</p>	<p>Aut non legistis in lege quia sabbatis sacerdotes in templo sabbatum uiolant et sine crimine sunt?</p>
12:6	<p>Dico autem uobis quia templo maior est hic.</p>	<p>Dico autem uobis quia templo maior est hic.</p>
12:7	<p>Si autem sciretis quid est: Misericordiam uolo et non sacrificium, numquam condemnassetis innocentes.</p>	<p>Si autem sciretis quid est: Misericordiam uolo et non sacrificium, numquam condemnassetis innocentes.</p>

12:9-10	Et cum inde transisset uenit in synagogam eorum. Et ecce homo manum habens aridam.  Et interrogabant eum dicentes: Si licet sabbatis curare ut accusarent eum.	Et cum inde transisset uenit in synagogam eorum. Et ecce homo manum habens aridam.  Et interrogabant eum dicentes: si licet sabbatis curare ut accusarent eum.
12:11-2	Ipse autem dixit illis: Quis erit ex uobis homo qui habeat ouem unam, et si ceciderit haec sabbatis in foueam, nonne tenebit et leuabit eam? Quanto magis melior est homo oue. Itaque licet sabbatis benefacere?	Ipse autem dixit illis: Quis erit ex uobis homo qui habeat ouem unam, et si ceciderit haec sabbatis in foueam, nonne tenebit et leuabit eam? Quanto magis melior est homo oue. Itaque licet sabbatis benefacere?
12:13	Tunc ait homini: Extende manum tuam. Et extendit, et restituta est sanitati sicut altera.	Tunc ait homini: extende manum tuam. Et extendit, et restituta est sanitati sicut altera.
12:14	Exeuntes autem Pharisei consilium faciebunt aduersus eum quomodo eum perderent.	Exeuntes autem Pharisei consilium faciebant aduersus eum quomodo eum perderent.
12:15	Iesus autem sciens recessit <sup>1</sup> inde.  <sup>1</sup> : potentially unique; otherwise occurs in Late Vulgate MSS, S and M Z D C	Iesus autem sciens r(/s)ecessit <sup>1</sup> inde.  <sup>1</sup> : Oxford edition has secessit <i>pace</i> Stuttgart, following the very oldest A F P G
12:18	Ecce puer meus quem eligi dilectus meus	Ecce puer meus quem elegi dilectus meus.
12:19	Neque audiet quis in plateis uocem eius.	Neque audiet <b>aliquis</b> in plateis vocem eius.
12:20	Harundinem quassatam non confringet et linum fumigans non extinguet.	Harundinem quassatam non confringet et linum fumigans non extinguet.
12:22	Tunc oblatus est ei daemonium habens caecus et mutus, et curauit eum ita ut loqueretur et uideret.	Tunc oblatus est ei daemonium habens caecus et mutus, et curauit eum ita ut loqueretur et uideret
12:25	Iesus autem sciens cogitationes eorum dixit eis: Omne regnum diuisum <b>intra</b> se <b>desolabitur</b> .	Iesus autem sciens cogitationes eorum dixit eis: omne regnum diuisum <b>contra</b> se <b>desolatur</b>
12:26	Si Satanas Satanan eicit, aduersus se diuisus est, quomodo ergo stabit regnum eius?	Et si Satanas Satanan eicit, aduersus se diuisus est, quomodo ergo stabit regnum eius?
12:27	Si ego in Beelzebub eicio daemones, filii uestri in quo eiciunt? Ideo ipsi iudices erunt uestri.	Et si ego in Beelzebub eicio daemones, filii uestri in quo eiciunt? Ideo ipsi iudices erunt uestri.

12:28	Si autem ego in Spiritu Dei eicio daemones, igitur peruenit in uos regnum Dei. <sup>10</sup>	{Si autem ego in Spiritu Dei} eicio daemones <sup>1</sup> , igitur peruenit <sup>2</sup> in uos regnum Dei.  {}: <i>aur fl</i> <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur l (q)</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur l (df)</i>
12:29	Aut quomodo potest quisquam intrare in domum fortis et uasa eius diripere, nisi prius alligauerit fortem et tunc domum illius <b>diripiet</b> .	Aut quomodo potest quisquam <sup>1</sup> intrare in domum fortis et uasa eius diripere, nisi prius alligauerit fortem et tunc domum illius <b>diripiat</b> . <sup>2</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur l</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>l VG</i>
12:30	Qui non est mecum contra me est et qui non congregat mecum spargit.	Qui non est mecum contra me est et qui non congregat mecum spargit. <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup> h l q</i>
12:32	Quicumque dixerit uerbum contra filium hominis remittetur ei, qui autem dixerit contra Spiritum sanctum non remittetur ei neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro. <sup>11</sup>	Et quicumque dixerit uerbum contra Filium hominis remittetur ei, qui autem dixerit contra Spiritum Sanctum non remittetur ei neque in hoc saeculo neque in futuro.
12:33	Aut facite arborem bonam et fructum eius bonum aut facite arborem malam et fructum eius malum. Ex <b>fructibus</b> <sup>1</sup> <b>enim</b> arbor agnoscitur.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Aut facite arborem bonam et fructum eius bonum aut facite arborem malam et fructum eius malum. <b>Siquidem</b> ex <b>fructu</b> arbor agnoscitur.
12:34	Progenies uiperarum quomodo potestis bona loqui cum sitis mali.	Progenies uiperarum quomodo potestis bona loqui cum sitis mali.
12:35	Bonus homo de bono thesauro profert bona, et malus homo de malo thesauro profert mala.	Bonus homo de bono thesauro profert bona, et malus homo de malo thesauro profert mala.
12:36	Dico autem uobis quoniam omne uerbum otiosum quod locuti fuerint homines reddent rationem <b>pro</b> <sup>1</sup> eo in die iudicii.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>d g<sup>1</sup></i>	Dico autem uobis quoniam omne uerbum otiosum quod locuti fuerint homines reddent rationem <b>de</b> <sup>2</sup> eo in die iudicii.  <sup>2</sup> : <i>a fff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> h</i>
12:38	Tunc reponderunt ei quidam de scribis et Phariseis dicentes: Uolumus <sup>1</sup> a te signum uidere.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. Magister, unique</i>	Tunc responderunt ei quidam de scribis et Phariseis dicentes: <b>Magister</b> uolumus a te signum uidere.

<sup>10</sup> Also quotes: Luc. 11:20: Si autem ego in digito dei eicio daemones. Luc. 17:21: Regnum Dei intra uos est. Jon. 1:26: Medius stat inter uos quem nescitis. Mt. 3:24:17: Paenitentiam agite, adpropinquauit enim regum caelorum.

<sup>11</sup> Mc. 3:30: Quia dicebant: Spiritum inmundum habet.

12:39-40	Ait illis: Generatio <b>praua</b> et adultera  Signum quaerit, et signum non dabitur <b>illi</b> nisi signum Ionae prophetae. Sicut enim fuit Ionas in uentre ceti tribus diebus et tribus noctibus, sic erit filius hominis in corde terrae tribus diebus ac <sup>1</sup> noctibus.  <sup>1</sup> : ac, <i>om.</i> tribus, unique	Ait illis: generatio <b>mala</b> et adultera  Signum quaerit, et signum non dabitur <b>ei</b> nisi signum Ionae prophetae. Sicut enim fuit Ionas in uentre ceti tribus diebus et tribus noctibus, sic erit Filius hominis in corde terrae tribus diebus <b>et tribus</b> noctibus
12:41	Uiri Nineuitae surgent in iudicio cum generatione ista et condemnabunt eam  Et ecce <b>hic</b> <sup>1</sup> plus quam Iona <sup>12</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : no clear <i>VL</i> evidence for this order, ecce +hic	Uiri Nineuitae surgent in iudicio cum generatione ista et condemnabunt eam  Et ecce plus quam Iona <b>hic</b>
12:42	Regina austri surget in iudicio cum generatione ista et condemnabit eam, quia uenit <b>a finibus</b> terrae audire sapientiam Salomnis.	Regina austri surget in iudicio cum generatione ista et condemnabit eam, quia uenit <b>a finibus</b> <sup>1</sup> terrae audire sapientiam Salomonis.  <sup>1</sup> : a finibus: <i>aur c d f g<sup>1</sup> h l</i>
12:43	Cum autem immundus spiritus exierit ab homine, ambulat per loca arida quaerens requiem et non inuenit.	Cum autem immundus spiritus exierit ab homine, ambulat per loca arida quaerens requiem et non inuenit.
12:44	Reuertar <b>ad</b> <sup>1</sup> domum meam pristinam unde exiui.  Et ueniens inuenit <b>domum</b> uacantem scopis mundatam.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Reuertar <b>in</b> <sup>1</sup> domum meam unde exiui.  Et ueniens inuenit uacantem scopis mundatam et ornatam  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b c d f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i>
12:46-7	Adhuc eo loquente ad turbas ecce mater eius et fratres <b>eius</b> <sup>1</sup> stabant foris quaerentes loqui ei. Dixit autem ei quidam: Ecce mater tua fratres tui foris stant quaerentes te.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c d q</i>	Adhuc eo loquente ad turbas ecce mater eius et fratres stabant foris quaerentes loqui ei. Dixit autem ei quidam: Ecce mater tua et fratres tui foris stant quaerentes te.
12:49 ‡	Extendens manum in discipulos {} <sup>1</sup> <b>ait</b> <sup>2</sup> : Ecce mater mea et fratres mei.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om.</i> suos, unique <sup>2</sup> : >ait, unique	Et extendens manum in discipulos <b>suos dixit</b> : Ecce mater mea et fratres mei.
13:1-2	In illo die exiens Iesus de domo sedebat secus mare, et congregatae sunt ad eum turbae multae  Ita ut in <b>nauicula</b> ascendens sederet, et omnis turba stabat in litore.	In illo die exiens Iesus de domo sedebat secus mare, et congregatae sunt ad eum turbae multae.  Ita ut in <b>nauiculam</b> ascendens sederet, et omnis turba stabat in litore.

<sup>12</sup> Following note is commentary on the adverb, hic. Placement here is thus not haphazardous.

13:3	Et locutus est eis multa in parabolis dicens  Ecce exiit qui seminat seminare.	Et locutus est eis multa in parabolis dicens  Ecce exiit qui seminat seminare.
13:4-5	Quaedam ceciderunt secus uiam, et uenerunt uolucres et comederunt ea: <b>et</b> <sup>1</sup> alia {} <sup>2</sup> ceciderunt in <b>petrosis</b> <sup>3</sup> ubi non <b>habebant</b> <sup>4</sup> terram multam  <sup>1</sup> : +et, unique <sup>2</sup> : <i>om.</i> autem, unique <sup>3</sup> : unique <sup>4</sup> : <i>aur b g</i> <sup>1</sup>	Quaedam ceciderunt secus uiam, et uenerunt uolucres et comederunt ea: alia <b>autem</b> ceciderunt in <b>petrosa</b> ubi non <b>habebat</b> terram multam.
13:9	Qui habet aures audiendi audiat.	Qui habet aures audiendi audiat.
13:10	Et accedentes discipuli dixerunt ei.	Et accedentes discipuli dixerunt ei.
13:12 ✕	Qui habet dabitur ei et abundabit, qui autem non habet et quod habet auferetur ab eo.	Qui <b>enim</b> habet dabitur ei et abundabit, qui autem non habet et quod habet auferetur ab eo.
13:13-4	Ideo in parabolis loquor eis quia uidentes non uident et audientes non audiunt  <b>Impleturque</b> <sup>1</sup> <b>in</b> <sup>2</sup> eis prophetia Esaiae: * <sup>3</sup> Audit uidentis et non intellegitis {et uidentes uidebitis et non uidebitis}.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>a aur b c d f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i> <sup>3</sup> : unique <i>om.</i> dicentis/dicens	Ideo in parabolis loquor eis quia uidentes non uident et audientes non audiunt <b>neque intellegunt</b>  <b>Et adimpletur</b> eis prophetia Esaiae: <b>dicens</b> auditu audietis et non intellegitis {et uidentes uidebitis et non uidebitis}.
13:15	Incrassatum est enim cor populi huius et {auribus grauiter audierunt et oculos suos <b>clausuerunt</b> <sup>1</sup> .}  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c</i>	Incrassatum est enim cor populi huius et {auribus grauiter audierunt et oculos suos <b>cluserunt</b> }
13:16	Uestri autem beati oculi quia uident et aures uestrae quia audiunt	Uestri autem beati oculi quia uident et aures uestrae quia audiunt
13:17	Amen quippe dico uobis quia multi prophetae et iusti cupierunt uidere quae uidetis, et non uiderunt <sup>1</sup> , et audire quae auditis, et non audierunt.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a</i> seems to have <i>audierunt</i> here as well; This must be a mistake.	Amen quippe dico uobis quia multi prophetae et iusti cupierunt uidere quae uidetis, et non uiderunt, et audire quae auditis, et non audierunt.
13:19	Omnis qui audit uerbum regni et non intellegit  Uenit malus et rapit quod seminatum est in corde eius	Omnis qui audit uerbum regni et non intellegit  Uenit malus et rapit quod seminatum est in corde eius.
13:21	Facta autem tribulatione et persecutione propter uerbum continuo scandalizatur.	Facta autem tribulatione et persecutione propter uerbum continuo scandalizatur.

13:22	Qui autem <b>seminat</b> <sup>1</sup> in spinis, hic est qui uerbum audit et sollicitudo, saeculi {istius et fallacia} diuitiarum suffocat uerbum et sine fructu efficitur.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Qui autem <b>est seminatus</b> in spinis, hic est qui uerbum audit et sollicitudo, saeculi {istius et fallacia} diuitiarum suffocat uerbum et sine fructu efficitur.
13:23	Qui uero in terra bona seminatus est, hic est qui audit uerbum et intellegit et fructum adfert.	Qui uero in terra bona seminatus est, hic est qui audit uerbum et intellegit et fructum adfert.
13:24-5	Aliam parabolam proposuit illis dicens: Simile factum est regnum caelorum homini qui seminauit bonum semen in agro suo; cum autem dormirent homines, uenit inimicus eius et superseminauit zizania in medio tritici.	Aliam parabolam proposuit illis dicens: Simile factum est regnum caelorum homini qui seminauit bonum semen in agro suo; cum autem dormirent homines uenit inimicus eius et superseminauit zizania in medio tritici.
13:31	Aliam parabolam proposuit eis dicens. <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : potentially confused with previous citation	Aliam parabolam proposuit eis dicens.
13:31-2	Simile est regnum caelorum grano sinapis, quod accipiens homo seminauit in agro suo; quod minimum quidem est omnibus seminibus, cum autem creuerit maius est omnibus holeribus et fit arbor, ita ut uolucres caeli ueniant et habitent in ramis eius.	Simile est regnum caelorum grano sinapis, quod accipiens homo seminauit in agro suo; quod minimum quidem est omnibus seminibus, cum autem creuerit maius est omnibus holeribus et fit arbor ita ut uolucres caeli ueniant et habitent in ramis eius
13:33	Aliam parabolam locutus est eis: Simile est regnum caelorum fermento, quod acceptum mulier abscondit in farinae satis tribus, donec fermentatum est totum.	Aliam parabolam locutus est eis: Simile est regnum caelorum fermento, quod acceptum mulier abscondit in farinae satis tribus, donec fermentatum est totum.
13:34	Haec omnia locutus est Iesus in parabolis(1) ad turbas, et sine parabolis(2) non loquebatur eis.	Haec omnia locutus est Iesus in parabolis ad turbas, et sine parabolis non loquebatur eis.
13:35	Ut impleretur quod dictum est per prophetam dicentem: Aperiam in parabolis os meum; eructabo abscondita a constitutione mundi.	Ut impleretur quod dictum erat per prophetam dicentem: Aperiam in parabolis os meum; eructabo abscondita a constitutione mundi.
13:36	Tunc dimissis turbis uenit in domum. Et accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius dicentes: Dissere nobis parabolam zizaniorum agri.	Tunc dimissis turbis uenit in domum. Et accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius dicentes: Dissere nobis parabolam zizaniorum agri.
13:37	Qui(1) respondens ait: Qui seminat bonum semen est filius hominis.	Qui respondens ait: Qui seminat bonum semen est Filius hominis.
13:43 ✕	Tunc iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno patris <b>sui</b> .	Tunc iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno Patris <b>eorum</b> .

13:44 <sup>13</sup>	<p>Simile est regnum caelorum thesauro abscondito in agro, quem qui <b>inuenerit</b><sup>1</sup> homo abscondit: et prae gaudio illius uadit et uendit uniuersa quae habet et emit agrum illum.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>a b l</i></p>	<p>Simile est regnum caelorum thesauro abscondito in agro, quem qui <b>inuenit</b> homo abscondit: et prae gaudio illius uadit et uendit uniuersa quae habet et emit agrum illum.</p>
13:45-6	<p>Iterum simile est regnum caelorum homini negotiatori quaerenti bonas margaritas; inuenta autem una <b>pretiosissima</b><sup>1</sup> margarita, abiit et uendidit omnia quae habuit et emit eam.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>unique</i></p>	<p>Iterum simile est regnum caelorum homini negotiatori quaerenti bonas margaritas; inuenta autem una <b>pretiosa</b> margarita, abiit et uendidit omnia quae habuit et emit eam.</p>
13:47-9	<p>Iterum simile est regnum caelorum sagenae missae in mare et ex omni genere piscium congreganti; Quam cum impleta esset educentes, et secus litus sedentes, elegerunt bonos in uasa <b>sua</b><sup>1</sup>, malos, autem foras miserunt; sic erit in consummatione saeculi.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>unique, similar to aur d ff<sup>1</sup> l q (suis)</i></p>	<p>Iterum simile est regnum caelorum sagenae missae in mare et ex omni genere congreganti; Quam cum impleta esset educentes, et secus litus sedentes, elegerunt bonos in uasa, malos, autem foras miserunt; sic erit in consummatione saeculi.</p>
13:51	Intellexistis haec omnia? Dicunt ei: Etiam.	Intellexistis haec omnia? Dicunt ei: Etiam.
13:52	Ideo omnis scribe doctus in regno caelorum similis est homini patrifamilias qui profert de thesauro suo noua et uetera.	Ideo omnis scribe doctus in regno caelorum similis est homini patri familias qui profert de thesauro suo noua et uetera.
13:53-4	<p>Et factum est cum consummasset Iesus parabolas istas, trasiit inde et ueniens in <b>terram</b><sup>1</sup> suam, docebat eos in <b>synagoga</b><sup>2</sup> eorum.</p> <p>Unde huic sapientia haec et uirtutes?</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>unique</i> <sup>2</sup>: <i>unique; synagogas, d</i></p>	<p>Et factum est cum consummasset Iesus parabolas istas, transiit inde et ueniens in <b>patriam</b> suam, docebat eos in <b>synagogis</b> eorum.</p> <p>Unde huic sapientia haec et uirtutes?</p>
13:55-6	<p>Nonne hic est fabri filius? Nonne mater eius dicitur Maria et fratres eius Iacobus et Ioseph, Simon et Iudas, et sorores *<sup>1</sup> eius omnes apud nos sunt?</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>ff<sup>1</sup> h</i></p>	<p>Nonne hic est fabri filius? Nonne mater eius dicitur Maria et fratres eius Iacobus et Ioseph, et Simon et Iudas, et sorores eius <b>nonne</b> omnes apud nos sunt?</p>
13:57	Iesus autem dixit eis: Non est propheta sine honore nisi in patria sua et in domo sua.	Iesus autem dixit eis: Non est propheta sine honore nisi in patria sua et in domo sua.
13:58	Et <b>idcirco</b> non fecit ibi uirtutes multas propter incredulitatem illorum.	Et non fecit ibi uirtutes multas propter incredulitatem illorum.

<sup>13</sup> Col. 2:3: in quo sunt omnes thesauri sapientiae et scientiae absconditi

14:1-2	In illo tempore <b>audiuit</b> <sup>1</sup> Herodes tetrarcha famam Iesu, et ait pueris suis: Hic est Iohannes Baptista, ipse surrexit a mortuis, et ideo uirtutes <b>operantur</b> in eo.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c d fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l</i>	In illo tempore <b>audiit</b> <sup>1</sup> Herodes tetrarcha famam Iesu, et ait pueris suis: Hic est Iohannes Baptista, ipse surrexit a mortuis, et ideo virtutes <b>inoperantur</b> in eo.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b c ff<sup>2</sup></i>
14:3-4	Herodes <b>autem</b> tenuit Iohannem et alligauit eum et posuit in <b>carcerem</b> propter Herodiam uxorem fratris sui. Dicebat enim illi Iohannes: Non licet tibi habere eam.	Herodes <b>enim</b> tenuit Iohannem et alligauit eum et posuit in <b>carcere</b> propter Herodiam uxorem fratris sui. Dicebat enim illi Iohannes: non licet tibi habere eam.
14:5	Et uolens illum occidere, timuit populum, quia sicut prophetam <b>illum</b> habebant.	Et volens illum occidere, timuit populum, quia sicut prophetam <b>eum</b> habebant.
14:6	Die autem natalis Herodis saltauit filia Herodiadis in medio <b>triclinio</b> , et placuit Herodi.	Die autem natalis Herodis saltauit filia Herodiadis in medio et placuit Herodi.
14:7	Cum iuramento pollicitus est ei dare quodcumque postulasset ab eo.	Cum iuramento pollicitus est ei dare quodcumque postulasset ab eo.
14:8	Da mihi, inquit, hic in disco caput Iohannis Baptistae.	Da mihi, inquit, hic in disco caput Iohannis Baptistae.
14:9	Et contristatus est rex.  Propter iuramentum autem et eos qui pariter <b>discumbebant</b> <sup>1</sup> iussit dari.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>discumbentes, f</i>	Et contristatus est rex.  Propter iuramentum autem et eos qui pariter <b>recumbebant</b> iussit dari.
14:11	Et <b>allatum</b> <sup>1</sup> est caput eius in disco et datum est puellae, et tulit matri suae.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>unique</i>	Et <b>adlatum</b> est caput eius in disco et datum est puellae, et tulit matri suae.
14:12	Et accedentes discipuli eius tulerunt corpus <b>eius</b> et sepelierunt illud et uenientes nuntiauerunt Iesu.	Et accedentes discipuli eius tulerunt corpus et sepelierunt illud et uenientes nuntiauerunt Iesu.
14:13	Quod cum audisset Iesus, secessit inde in nauicula in locum desertum seorsum.  Et cum audissent turbae, secutae sunt eum pedestres de ciuitatibus	Quod cum audisset Iesus, secessit inde in nauicula in locum desertum seorsum.  Et cum audissent turbae, secutae sunt eum pedestres de ciuitatibus.
14:14	Et exiens uidit turbam multam.	Et exiens uidit turbam multam.
14:15	Uespere autem facto, accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius dicentes	Uespere autem facto, accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius dicentes.
14:16	Iesus autem dixit eis: Non habent necesse ire; date illis uos manducare.	Iesus autem dixit eis: Non habent necesse ire; date illis uos manducare.
14:17	Responderunt ei: Non habemus hic nisi quinque panes et duos pisces.	Responderunt ei: Non habemus hic nisi quinque panes et duos pisces.
14:18	{Qui ait eis}: <b>Afferte</b> <sup>1</sup> illos mihi huc.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>unique</i>	{Qui ait eis}: <b>Adferte</b> illos mihi huc.



14:19	Et cum iussisset turbam discumbere supra <b>fenum</b> .  Acceptis quinque panibus et duobus piscibus, aspiciens in caelum, benedixit et fregit et dedit discipulis panes.  Et dedit discipulis panes, discipuli autem turbis.	Et cum iussisset turbam discumbere supra <b>faenum</b> .  Acceptis quinque panibus et duobus piscibus, aspiciens in caelum, benedixit et fregit et dedit discipulis panes discipuli autem turbis.
14:20	Et tulerunt reliquias duodecim <b>cophinos</b> fragmentorum plenos.	Et tulerunt reliquias duodecim <b>cofinos</b> fragmentorum plenos.
14:21	Manducantium autem fuit numerus quinque milia uirorum, exceptis mulieribus et paruulis.	Manducantium autem fuit numerus quinque milia uirorum, exceptis mulieribus et paruulis.
14:22	{Et <b>compulit</b> } discipulos <b>suos</b> ascendere <b>naiculam</b> et praecedere eum trans fretum, donec dimitteret turbas.	{Et <b>statim iussit</b> } discipulos ascendere <b>in naicula</b> et praecedere eum trans fretum donec dimitteret turbas.
14:23	Et dimissa turba, ascendit in montem solus orare.	Et dimissa turba, ascendit in montem solus orare.
14:24	Nauicula autem in medio mari iacabatur fluctibus.	Nauicula autem in medio mari iactabatur fluctibus.
14:25	Quarta autem uigilia noctis uenit ad eos ambulans supra mare.	Quarta autem uigilia noctis uenit ad eos ambulans supra mare.
14:26	Et(1) uidentes eum supra mare ambulantem, turbati sunt dicentes: Quia fantasma est.  Et prae timore clamauerunt.	Et(1) uidentes eum supra mare ambulantem, turbati sunt dicentes: Quia fantasma est.  Et prae timore clamauerunt.
14:27	Statimque Iesus locutus est eis dicens: Habete fiduciam <sup>1</sup> , ego sum <sup>2</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c fl</i> <sup>2</sup> : ego sum (nolite timere): <i>aur c d fl q</i>	Statimque Iesus locutus est eis dicens: Habete fiduciam, ego sum (nolite timere).
14:28	Respondens autem Petrus dixit: Domine, si tu es, iube me uenire ad te super aquas <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fl</i>	Respondens autem Petrus dixit: Domine, si tu es, iube me uenire ad te super aquas.
14:29	Et descendens Petrus de nauicula ambulabat super aquam.	Et descendens Petrus de nauicula ambulabat super aquam.
14:30	Videns <b>autem</b> uentum ualidum, timuit et cum coepisset mergi, clamauit dicens: Domine saluum me fac.	Uidens <b>uero</b> uentum ualidum, timuit et cum coepisset mergi, clamauit dicens: Domine saluum me fac.
14:31	Et continuo Iesus extendens manum adprehendit eum et ait illi: Modicae fidei quare dubitasti?	Et continuo Iesus extendens manum adprehendit eum et ait illi: Modicae fidei quare dubitasti?
14:33	Qui in nauicula erant, uenerunt et adorauerunt eum dicentes: Uere filius Dei es.	Qui <b>autem</b> in nauicula erant, uenerunt et adorauerunt eum dicentes: Uere Filius Dei es.

14:34	Et cum transfretassent uenerunt in terram <b>Genesareth</b> <sup>1</sup> . <sup>1</sup> : >Gennezareth <i>q, -t f</i>	Et cum transfretassent uenerunt in terram <b>Gennesar</b> .
14:35	Et cum cognouissent eum uiri loci illius <sup>1</sup> , miserunt in uniuersam regionem illam. <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. adorabant... aur d f ff<sup>2</sup> m.2 g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>	Et cum cognouissent eum uiri loci illius, miserunt in uniuersam regionem illam.
14:35-6	Et obtulerunt ei omnes male habentes, et rogabant eum ut uel fimbriam uestimenti eius tangerent, et quicumque tetigerunt salui facti sunt.	Et obtulerunt ei omnes male habentes, et rogabant eum ut uel fimbriam uestimenti eius tangerent*, et quicumque tetigerunt salui facti sunt.
15:2	Quare discipuli tui transgrediuntur traditionem seniorum?  Non enim lauant manus suas cum panem manducant.	Quare discipuli tui transgrediuntur traditionem seniorum?  Non enim lauant manus suas cum panem manducant.
15:3	Ipse autem respondens ait illis: Quare et uos transgredimini mandatum Dei propter traditionem uestram?	Ipse autem respondens ait illis: Quare et uos transgredimini mandatum Dei propter traditionem uestram?
15:4-6	Nam Deus dixit: Honora {patrem et matrem}, et qui maledixerit patri uel matri* morte moriatur. Uos autem dicitis: Quicumque dixerit patri uel matri: Munus quodcumque est ex ex merme tibi proderit: et non <b>honorauit</b> patrem suum aut matrem <sup>#</sup> .	Nam Deus dixit: Honora {patrem et matrem}, et qui maledixerit patri uel matri* morte moriatur. Uos autem dicitis: Quicumque dixerit patri uel matri: Munus quodcumque est ex me tibi proderit: et non <b>honorificabit</b> patrem suum aut matrem <sup>#</sup> .
15:11	Non quod intrat in os <b>communicat</b> (1) hominem, sed quod procedit ex ore, hoc <b>communicat</b> (2) hominem.  <i>communicat (1) d, (2) c d</i>	Non quod intrat in os <b>coinquinat</b> (1) hominem, sed quod procedit ex ore, hoc <b>coinquinat</b> (2) hominem.
15:12	Tunc accedentes discipuli eius dixerunt ei: Scis quia Pharisei audito uerbo scandalizati sunt.	Tunc accedentes discipuli eius dixerunt ei: Scis quia Pharisei audito uerbo scandalizati sunt.
15:13 ✕	At ille respondens ait: Omnis plantatio quam non plantauit Pater meus caelestis eradicabitur.	At ille respondens ait: omnis plantatio quam non plantauit Pater meus caelestis eradicabitur.
15:14	Sinite illos; caeci sunt, duces caecorum.	Sinite illos; caeci sunt, duces caecorum.
15:15-6	Respondens autem Petrus dixit ei: Edissere nobis parabolam istam. <b>Et</b> ille dixit: Adhuc et uos sine intellectu estis?	Respondens autem Petrus dixit ei: Edissere nobis parabolam istam. <b>At</b> ille dixit: Adhuc et uos sine intellectu estis?
15:17	Non intellegitis quia omne quod <b>intrat in os</b> <sup>1</sup> in uentrem uadit et in secessum emittitur?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>ff<sup>2</sup></i>	Non intellegitis quia omne quod <b>in os intrat</b> in uentrem uadit et in secessum emittitur?

15:19 ✠	De corde enim exeunt cogitationes malae, homicidia adulteria, fornicationes.	De corde enim exeunt cogitationes malae, homicidia adulteria fornicationes.
15:21	Et egressus inde Iesus secessit in partes Tyri et Sidonis.	Et egressus inde Iesus secessit in partes Tyri et Sidonis.
15:22	Misserere mei, Domine fili Daud, filia mea male a daemonio uexatur.	Miserere mei, Domine Fili David, filia mea male a daemonio uexatur.
15:23	Qui non respondit ei uerbum.  Et accedentes discipuli eius rogabant eum dicentes: Dimitte eam quia clamat post nos.	Qui non respondit ei uerbum.  Et accedentes discipuli eius rogabant eum dicentes: Dimitte eam quia clamat post nos.
15:24 ✠	Non sum missus nisi ad oues <b>perditas</b> <sup>1</sup> domus Israhel.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>ff<sup>1</sup> q, (Ep. 121.5)</i>	Non sum missus nisi ad oues <b>quae</b> <b>perierunt</b> <sup>1</sup> domus Israhel.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>Jülicher (ex-a)</i>
15:25	At illa uenit et adorauit eum dicens.	At illa uenit et adorauit eum dicens.
15:27	At illa dixit: Etiam, Domine, nam et catelli edunt de micis quae cadunt de mensa dominorum suorum.	At illa dixit: Etiam, Domine, nam et catelli edunt de micis quae cadunt de mensa dominorum suorum.
15:29-30	<b>Cumque</b> <sup>1</sup> transisset inde Iesus, uenit secus mare <b>Galileae</b> <sup>2</sup> , et ascendens in montem sedebat ibi. Et accesserunt ad eum turbae multae, habentes secum mutos, <b>claudos</b> <sup>3</sup> , caecos, debiles et alios multos, et proiecerunt eos ad pedes eius.  <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : unique <sup>3</sup> : unique	<b>Et cum</b> transisset inde Iesus, uenit secus mare <b>Galilaeae</b> , et ascendens in montem sedebat ibi. Et accesserunt ad eum turbae multae, habentes secum mutos, <b>clodos</b> , caecos, debiles et alios multos, et proiecerunt eos ad pedes eius.
15:30-1	Et curauit eos. Ita ut turbae mirarentur, uidentes {mutos loquentes, <b>claudos</b> <sup>1</sup> ambulantes, caecos uidentes;} et magnificabant Deum Israhel.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c l</i>	Et curauit eos. Ita ut turbae mirarentur, uidentes {mutos loquentes, <b>clodos</b> <sup>1</sup> ambulantes, caecos uidentes;} et magnificabant Deum Israhel.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b d fff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> q r<sup>1</sup></i>
15:32	Iesus autem conuocatis discipulis suis <b>ait</b> <sup>1</sup> : Misereor turbae, quia triduo iam perseuerant mecum et non habent quod manducent, et dimittere eos ieiunos nolo, ne deficiant in uia.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Iesus autem conuocatis discipulis suis <b>dixit</b> <sup>1</sup> : Misereor turbae, quia triduo iam perseuerant mecum et non habent quod manducent, et dimittere eos ieiunos nolo, ne deficiant in uia.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>cet.</i>
15:33-4	Et dicunt ei discipuli: Unde ergo nobis in deserto panes tantos ut saturemus turbam tantam? Et ait illis Iesus: Quot panes habetis? At illi dixerunt: Septem et paucos pisciculos.	Et dicunt ei discipuli: Unde ergo nobis in deserto panes tantos ut saturemus turbam tantam? Et ait illis Iesus: quot panes habetis? At illi dixerunt: Septem et paucos pisciculos.

16:2-4	Ait ille respondens ait eis: Facto uespere dicitis: Serenum erit, rubicundum est enim caelum; et mane. Hodie tempestas, rutilat enim triste caelum. Faciem ergo caeli <b>iudicare</b> <sup>1</sup> nostis, signa autem temporum non potestis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>d</i>	At ille respondens ait eis: Facto uespere dicitis: Serenum erit, rubicundum est enim caelum; et mane. Hodie tempestas, rutilat enim triste caelum. Faciem ergo caeli <b>diudicare</b> <sup>1</sup> nostis, signa autem temporum non potestis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>fl</i>
16:4,5,4	Et relictis illis abiit, et cum uenissent discipuli eius trans fretum, obliti sunt panes accipere.  Generatio mala et adultera signum quaerit, et signum non dabitur ei nisi signum Ionae.	Et relictis illis abiit, et cum uenissent discipuli eius trans fretum, obliti sunt panes accipere.  Generatio mala et adultera signum quaerit, et signum non dabitur ei nisi signum Ionae.
16:6	Cauete <sup>1</sup> a fermento Phariseorum et Sadducaeorum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>	Cauete a fermento Phariseorum et Sadducaeorum.
16:8-9	Quid cogitatis <b>intra</b> uos modicae fidei quia panes non habetis? Nondum intellegitis neque recordamini quinque* panum quinque# <b>milia</b> <sup>1</sup> hominum et quot <b>cophinos</b> sumpsistis?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c fff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>	Quid cogitatis <b>inter</b> uos modicae fidei quia panes non habetis? Nondum intellegitis neque recordamini quinque* panum quinque# <b>miliu</b> hominum et quot <b>cofinos</b> sumpsistis?
16:13	Uenit autem Iesus in partes Caesareae Philippi.  Et interrogabat discipulos suos dicens: quem dicunt homines esse Filium hominis?	Uenit autem Iesus in partes Caesareae Philippi.  Et interrogabat discipulos suos dicens: quem dicunt homines esse Filium hominis?
16:14	At illi dixerunt: alii(1) Iohannem Baptistam, alii Heliam, alii uero Hieremiam aut unum ex prophetis.	At illi dixerunt: alii(1) Iohannem Baptistam, alii <b>autem</b> Heliam, alii uero Hieremiam aut unum ex prophetis.
16:15-6	Uos autem quem me esse dicitis? <b>Respondit</b> <sup>1</sup> Simon Petrus {} <sup>2</sup> : tu es Christus filius dei uiui.  <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : unique	Uos autem quem me esse dicitis? <b>Respondens</b> <sup>1</sup> Simon Petrus <b>dixit</b> <sup>2</sup> tu es Christus Filius Dei uiui.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>cet.</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>cet.</i>
16:17	Respondens Iesus dixit ei: beatus es Simon Bar Iona quia caro et sanguis non reuelauit tibi sed Pater meus qui in caelis est.	Respondens <b>autem</b> Iesus dixit ei: beatus es Simon Bar Iona quia caro et sanguis non reuelauit tibi sed Pater meus qui in caelis est.

16:18	<p>Et ego dico tibi.</p> <p>Quia tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam.</p> <p>Et portae inferi {non praeualebunt aduersus eam.}</p>	<p>Et ego dico tibi.</p> <p>Quia tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam.</p> <p>Et portae inferi {non praeualebunt aduersum eam.}</p>
16:19	<p>Et tibi dabo clauēs regni caelorum, et quodcumque ligaueris super(1) terram erit ligatum et in caelis et quodcumque solueris super(2) terram erit solutum et in caelis.</p>	<p>Et tibi dabo clauēs regni caelorum, et quodcumque ligaueris super(1) terram erit ligatum in caelis et quodcumque solueris super(2) terram erit solutum in caelis.</p>
16:20	<p>Tunc praecepit discipulis suis ut nemini dicerent quia ipse esset Iesus Christus.</p>	<p>Tunc praecepit discipulis suis ut nemini dicerent quia ipse esset Iesus Christus.</p>
16:21	<p>Exinde coepit Iesus ostendere discipulis suis quia oporteret eum ire Hierosolimam et multa pati a senioribus et scribis et principibus sacerdotum et occidi et tertia die resurgere.</p>	<p>Exinde coepit Iesus ostendere discipulis suis quia oporteret eum ire Hierosolimam et multa pati a senioribus et scribis et principibus sacerdotum et occidi et tertia die resurgere.</p>
16:22-3	<p>Et adsumens eum Petrus coepit increpare illum dicens: absit a te, Domine, non erit tibi hoc. Qui conuersus dixit Petro: uade post me, <b>Satanas</b>, scandalum es mihi quia non sapis ea quae {Dei sunt sed ea quae hominum.}</p>	<p>Et adsumens eum Petrus coepit increpare illum dicens: absit a te, Domine, non erit tibi hoc. Qui conuersus dixit Petro: uade post me, <b>Satana</b> scandalum es mihi quia non sapis ea quae {Dei sunt sed ea quae hominum.}</p>
16:24	<p>Tunc Iesus dixit discipulis suis: si quis uult post me uenire abneget se ipsum et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me. [Ep. 14.6]</p>	<p>Tunc Iesus dixit discipulis suis: si quis uult post me uenire abneget <b>semet</b><sup>1</sup> ipsum et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me. <sup>1</sup>: <i>fl</i></p>
16:26	<p>Aut quam dabit homo commutationem pro anima sua?</p>	<p>Aut quam dabit homo commutationem pro anima sua?</p>
16:27	<p>{Filius enim hominis uenturus est} in gloria Patris sui cum angelis suis et tunc reddet unicuique secundum opus eius.</p>	<p>{Filius enim hominis uenturus est} in gloria Patris sui cum angelis suis et tunc reddet unicuique secundum opus eius.</p>
16:28	<p>Amen dico uobis: sunt quidam de hic <b>adstantibus</b><sup>1</sup> qui non gustabunt mortem donec uideant Filium hominis uenientem in regno suo.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>a aur b c f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup></i></p>	<p>Amen dico uobis: sunt quidam de hic <b>stantibus</b> qui non gustabunt mortem donec uideant Filium hominis uenientem in regno suo.</p>
17:1	<p>Et post dies sex <b>adsumens</b> Iesus Petrum et Iacobum et Iohannem fratrem eius.</p> <p>Et ducit illos in montem excelsum seorsum.</p>	<p>Et post dies sex <b>adsumpsit</b> Iesus Petrum et Iacobum et Iohannem fratrem eius.</p> <p>Et ducit<sup>1</sup> illos in montem excelsum seorsum.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>aur b ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> l</i></p>

17:2	Et transfiguratus est ante eos.  et resplenduit facies eius sicut sol, uestimenta autem eius facta sunt alba sicut nix.	Eet transfiguratus est ante eos.  Et resplenduit facies eius sicut sol, uestimenta autem eius facta sunt alba sicut nix.
17:3	Et ecce apparuit illis <b>Moyse</b> s et Helias cum eo loquentes.	Et ecce apparuit illis <b>Moses</b> et Helias cum eo loquentes
17:4	Respondens autem Petrus dixit ad Iesum: Domine, bonum est nos hic esse.  Si uis, <b>faciam</b> hic tria tabernacula, tibi unum, et <b>Moysi</b> unum et Heliae unum.	Respondens autem Petrus dixit ad Iesum: Domine, bonum est nos hic esse.  Si uis, <b>faciamus</b> hic tria tabernacula, tibi unum, et <b>Mosi</b> unum et Heliae unum.
17:5	Adhuc eo loquente ecce nubes lucida obumbravit <sup>1</sup> eos et {} <sup>2</sup> uox de nube dicens: hic est Filius meus dilectus in quo mihi <b>conplacui</b> <sup>3</sup> , ipsum audite.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c fl q (-bat) d ff<sup>1</sup></i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>om. ecce, unique</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>a aur c d ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup></i>	Adhuc eo loquente ecce nubes lucida obumbravit eos et <b>ecce</b> uox de nube dicens: hic est Filius meus dilectus in quo mihi bene <b>conplacuit</b> <sup>1</sup> , ipsum audite.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b f g<sup>1</sup> q (Jülicher)</i>
17:6	Et audientes discipuli ceciderunt in faciem suam et timuerunt ualde.	Et audientes discipuli ceciderunt in faciem suam et timuerunt ualde.
17:7	Et accessit Iesus et tetigit eos.  Dixitque <sup>1</sup> eis: surgite et nolite timere.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b c l; &gt;et dixit, d ff<sup>2</sup> q</i>	Et accessit Iesus et tetigit eos.  Dixitque eis: surgite et nolite timere.
17:8	Leuantes autem oculos suos neminem uiderunt nisi solum Iesum.	Leuantes autem oculos suos neminem uiderunt nisi solum Iesum.
17:9	Et descendantibus illis de monte praecepit Iesus dicens: nemini dixeritis uisionem <sup>1</sup> donec Filius hominis a mortuis resurgat.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fl</i>	Et descendantibus illis de monte praecepit Iesus dicens: nemini dixeritis uisionem donec Filius hominis a mortuis resurgat.
17:10	Et interrogauerunt eum discipuli dicentes: quid ergo scribae dicunt quod Heliam oporteat primum uenire?	Et interrogauerunt eum discipuli dicentes: quid ergo scribae dicunt quod Heliam oporteat primum uenire?
17:11-2	At ille respondens ait eis: Helias quidem uenturus est et restituet omnia; dico autem uobis quia Helias iam uenit.  Sic et Filius hominis passurus est <sup>1</sup> ab eis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur f ff<sup>1</sup> l q; &gt;necesse habet, a b c ff</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>g<sup>1</sup> r<sup>1</sup></i>	At ille respondens ait eis: Helias quidem uenturus est et restituet omnia; dico autem uobis quia Helias iam uenit.  Sic et Filius hominis passurus est ab eis.

17:14-5	Domine miserere <b>filio meo</b> quia lunaticus est et male patitur, nam saepe cadit in ignem et crebro in aquam; et obtuli eum discipulis tuis et non potuerunt curare eum.	Domine miserere <b>fili mei</b> quia lunaticus est et male patitur, nam saepe cadit in ignem et crebro in aquam; et obtuli eum discipulis tuis et non potuerunt curare eum
17:16 ✠	Respondens Iesus ait: o generatio incredula et peruersa {quo usque ero uobiscum? usquequo patiar uos?} <sup>1</sup>  Adferte <b>eum</b> <sup>2</sup> huc ad me.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur (d) fl q</i> ; Hilary <i>Com. Matt.</i> 17.6 <sup>2</sup> : unique	Respondens Iesus ait: o generatio incredula et peruersa quousque ero uobiscum? usquequo patiar uos?  Adferte huc <b>illum</b> ad me.
17:16-7	Et increpauit <b>eum</b> <sup>1</sup> Iesus, et exiit ab eo daemonium.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a b l n q</i>	Et increpauit <b>ei</b> <sup>1</sup> Iesus, et exiit ab eo daemonium.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur d fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup></i>
17:18-9	Et dixerunt: quare nos non potuimus eicere illum? <b>Qui</b> dixit illis: propter incredulitatem uestram.  Si habueritis fidem {} ut granum sinapis, dicetis monti huic: transi hinc, et transibit.  { } : <i>om.</i> unique	Et dixerunt: quare nos non potuimus eicere illum? Dicit illis: propter incredulitatem uestram.  Si habueritis fidem <b>sicut</b> granum sinapis, dicetis monti huic: transi hinc, et transibit.
17:20	Hoc autem genus non eicitur nisi per orationem et ieiunium.	Hoc autem genus non eicitur nisi per orationem et ieiunium.
17:21-2	Conuersantibus autem <sup>1</sup> eis in Galilea dixit illis Iesus: {Filius hominis tradendus est} in manus hominum, et occident eum, et <b>tertia</b> <sup>2</sup> die resurget. Et contristati sunt uehementer.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur f g<sup>1</sup> l q</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>	Conuersantibus autem eis in Galilaea dixit illis Iesus: Filius hominis tradendus est in manus hominum, et occident eum, et <b>tertio</b> die resurget. Et contristati sunt uehementer.
17:24	Et cum intrasset <sup>1</sup> domum praeuenit eum Iesus dicens.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c f g<sup>1</sup> l q</i> ; > <b>introisset</b> , <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup></i>	Et cum intrasset domum praeuenit eum Iesus dicens
17:24-5	Quid tibi uidetur Simon? Reges terrae a quibus accipiunt tributum uel census, a filiis suis an ab alienis? Et ille dixit: ab alienis. Dixit illi Iesus: ergo liberi sunt filii.	Quid tibi uidetur Simon? Reges terrae a quibus accipiunt tributum uel census, a filiis suis an ab alienis? Et ille dixit: ab alienis. Dixit illi Iesus: ergo liberi sunt filii.
17:26	Uade ad mare et mitte hamum et eum piscem qui primus ascenderit tolle et aperto ore eius inuenies staterem; illum sumens da eis pro me et te.	Uade ad mare et mitte hamum et eum piscem qui primus ascenderit tolle et aperto ore eius inuenies staterem; illum sumens da eis pro me et te.

18:1	In illa hora <sup>1</sup> accesserunt discipuli ad Iesum dicentes: quis putas <sup>2</sup> maior est in regno caelorum?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>d f l q</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>a aur f f f<sup>2</sup> l n q r<sup>1</sup></i>	In illa hora accesserunt discipuli ad Iesum dicentes: quis putas maior est in regno caelorum?
18:2	{Et aduocans Iesus} <sup>1</sup> paruulum <sup>2</sup> statuit eum in medio eorum.  <sup>1</sup> : {}, <i>d f l</i> . Et uocans Iesus, <i>aur q</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>a b c d f f<sup>1</sup> f f<sup>2</sup> n q r<sup>1</sup></i>	Et aduocans Iesus paruulum statuit eum in medio eorum.
18:3	Amen dico uobis: nisi conuersi fueritis <b>ut</b> <sup>1</sup> efficiamini sicut paruuli, non intrabitis in regnum caelorum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c</i>	Amen dico uobis: nisi conuersi fueritis <b>et</b> efficiamini sicut paruuli, non intrabitis in regnum caelorum.
18:4	Quicumque ergo humiliauerit se sicut paruulus iste, hic est maior in regno caelorum.	Quicumque ergo humiliauerit se sicut paruulus iste, hic est maior in regno caelorum.
18:5	Et qui susceperit unum paruulum talem in nomine meo, me suscipit.	Et qui susceperit unum paruulum talem in nomine meo, me suscipit.
18:6	Qui autem scandalizauerit unum de pusillis istis.  Expedit ei ut suspendatur mola asinaria in collo eius et demergatur in profundum maris.	Qui autem scandalizauerit unum de pusillis istis.  Expedit ei ut suspendatur mola asinaria in collo eius et demergatur in profundum maris.
18:7 ✕	Uae mundo ab scandalis. Necesse est ut ueniant scandala uerumtamen uae homini per quem scandalum uenit.	Uae mundo ab scandalis. Necesse est <b>enim</b> ut ueniant scandala uerumtamen uae homini per quem scandalum uenit.
18:8	Si autem manus tua uel pes tuus {scandalizat te}, abscide eum et proice abs te	Si autem manus tua uel pes tuus {scandalizat te}, abscide eum et proice abs te
18:10	Uidete ne contemnatis unum <b>ex pusillis istis</b> <sup>1</sup> . Dico enim uobis quia angeli eorum semper uident faciem patris mei qui in caelis est.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>f q r<sup>1</sup></i>	Uidete ne contemnatis unum <b>ex his pusillis</b> . Dico enim uobis quia angeli eorum in caelis semper uident faciem Patris mei qui in caelis est
18:12	Quid uobis uidetur? Si fuerint alicui centum oues, et errauerit una ex eis, nonne <b>relinquit</b> <sup>1</sup> nonaginta nouem in montibus {et uadit quaerere} eam quae errauit?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>f f<sup>1</sup></i>	Quid uobis uidetur? Si fuerint alicui centum oues, et errauerit una ex eis, nonne <b>relinquet</b> nonaginta nouem in montibus {et uadit quaerere} eam quae errauit?
18:14	Sic non est uoluntas ante Patrem uestrum qui in caelis est ut pereat unus de pusillis istis.	Sic non est uoluntas ante Patrem uestrum qui in caelis est ut pereat unus de pusillis istis.



18:15-7 DC In Comm	Si autem peccauerit in te frater tuus, uade et corripe eum inter te et ipsum.	Si autem peccauerit in te frater tuus, vade et corripe eum inter te et ipsum.
18:18	Amen dico uobis: quaecumque alligaueritis super terram erunt ligata <sup>1</sup> et in caelo et quaecumque solueritis super terram erunt soluta et in caelo.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>f g<sup>1</sup> h l</i>	Amen dico uobis: quaecumque alligaueritis super terram erunt ligata et in caelo et quaecumque solueritis super terram erunt soluta et in caelo.
18:19- 20	Iterum dico uobis, quia si duo ex uobis consenserint super terram de omni re quamcumque petierint, fiet illis a Patre meo qui in caelis est. Ubi enim sunt duo uel tres congregati in nomine meo {ibi sum} in medio eorum.	Iterum dico uobis, quia si duo ex uobis consenserint super terram de omni re quacumque petierint fiet, illis a Patre meo qui in caelis est. Ubi enim sunt duo uel tres congregati in nomine meo {ibi sum} in medio eorum.
18:21- 22	Tunc accedens Petrus ad eum dixit: Domine quotiens peccabit in me frater meus et dimittam ei? Usque septies?  Non usque septies sed septuagies septies <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : unique, possible flattening	Tunc accedens Petrus ad eum dixit: Domine quotiens peccabit in me frater meus et dimittam ei? Usque septies?  Dicit illi Iesus <b>non</b> dico tibi usque septies sed usque septuagies septies
18:23	Ideo adsimilatum <sup>1</sup> est regnum <sup>2</sup> caelorum homini regi qui uoluit rationem ponere cum seruis suis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fl</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur c d fff<sup>1</sup> l (h)</i>	Ideo adsimilatum est regnum caelorum homini regi qui uoluit rationem ponere cum seruis suis.
18:24	Oblatus est ei unus qui debebat decem milia talenta.	Oblatus est ei unus qui debebat decem milia talenta.
18:35	Sic et Pater meus caelestis faciet uobis, si non remiseritis unusquisque fratri suo de cordibus uestris.	Sic et Pater meus caelestis faciet uobis, si non remiseritis unusquisque fratri suo de cordibus uestris.
19:3	Et accesserunt ad eum Pharisei temptantes eum et dicentes: si licet homini dimittere uxorem suam quacumque <b>de</b> causa.	Et accesserunt ad eum Pharisei temptantes eum et dicentes: si licet homini dimittere uxorem suam quacumque <b>ex</b> causa.
19:4	Non legistis quia qui fecit ab initio masculum et feminam fecit eos?	Non legistis quia qui fecit ab initio masculum et feminam fecit eos?
19:5	Propter hoc <b>dimittit</b> homo patrem et matrem et <b>adhaerebit</b> uxori suae.  Et erunt duo in carne una.	Propter hoc <b>dimittet</b> <sup>1</sup> homo patrem et matrem et <b>adherebit</b> uxori suae.  Et erunt duo in carne una  <sup>1</sup> : <i>l q</i>
19:6	Quod ergo Deus coniunxit {homo non separet}.	Quod ergo Deus coniunxit {homo non separet}.
19:7	Dicunt illi: quid ergo <b>Moyses</b> <sup>1</sup> mandauit dari libellum <sup>2</sup> repudii et dimittere?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>cet.</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur c fff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> r<sup>1</sup></i>	Dicunt illi: quid ergo <b>Moses</b> <sup>1</sup> mandavit dari libellum repudii et dimittere?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>g<sup>1</sup></i>

19:8	Ait illis: quoniam <b>Moyses</b> ad {duritiam cordis uestri} permisit uobis dimittere uxores uestras; ab initio autem <b>non fuit sic</b> .	Ait illis: quoniam <b>Moses</b> ad duritiam cordis uestri permisit uobis dimittere uxores uestras; ab initio autem <b>non sic fuit</b> <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>l</i>
19:9	Dico autem uobis quia quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam nisi ob fornicationem et aliam duxerit moechatur; {et qui dimissam duxerit moechatur} <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur cf[q]</i>	Dico autem uobis quia quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam nisi ob fornicationem et aliam duxerit moechatur; {et qui dimissam duxerit moechatur}.
19:10	Dicunt ei discipuli: {} <sup>1</sup> si ita est causa homini cum uxore, non expedit nubere.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. eius, ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup></i>	Dicunt ei discipuli: <b>eius</b> si ita est causa homini cum uxore, non expedit nubere.
19:11 ‡	Qui dixit: non omnes capiunt uerbum istud sed quibus datum est.	Qui dixit: non omnes capiunt uerbum istud sed quibus datum est.
19:12	Sunt enim eunuchi <sup>1</sup> qui de <b>utero matris</b> <sup>2</sup> sic nati sunt, et sunt eunuchi qui facti sunt ab hominibus, et sunt eunuchi qui se ipsos castrauerunt propter regnum caelorum. Qui potest capere capiat.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur d fl q; [x3]</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>~, c df q</i>	Sunt enim eunuchi qui de <b>matris utero</b> sic nati sunt, et sunt eunuchi qui facti sunt ab hominibus, et sunt eunuchi qui se ipsos castraverunt propter regnum caelorum. Qui potest capere capiat.
19:13	Tunc oblatis sunt ei paruuli <sup>1</sup> ut manus eis inponeret et oraret, discipuli autem et increpabant <b>eos</b> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fl</i>	Tunc oblatis sunt ei paruuli ut manus eis inponeret et oraret, discipuli autem increpabant <b>eis</b>
19:14	<b>Dimittite</b> <sup>1</sup> paruulos et nolite eos prohibere ad me uenire; talium est enim regnum caelorum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>d</i>	<b>Sinite</b> paruulos et nolite eos prohibere ad me uenire; talium est enim regnum caelorum.
19:16	Ecce unus accedens ait illi: magister bone, quid boni faciam ut habeam uitam aeternam?	Et ecce unus accedens ait illi: magister bone, quid boni faciam ut habeam uitam aeternam?
19:17	Quid me interrogas de bono? Unus est bonus Deus.	Quid me interrogas de bono? Unus est bonus Deus.
19:17-9	Si uis ad uitam ingredi, serua mandata. Dicit illi: quae? Iesus autem dixit: non homicidium facies <sup>1</sup> , non adulterabis. (et reliqua)  Et diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur g<sup>1</sup> l</i>	<b>Si autem</b> uis ad uitam ingredi, serua mandata. Dicit illi: quae? Iesus autem dixit: non homicidium facies, non adulterabis.  Et diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum.

19:20	Dicit illi adulescens: omnia haec custodiui; quid adhuc mihi deest?	Dicit illi adulescens: omnia haec custodiui; quid adhuc mihi deest?
19:21	Ait illi Iesus: si uis perfectus esse, uade, uende {quae habes} <sup>1</sup> et da pauperibus et habebis thesaurum in caelo et ueni, sequere me.  <sup>1</sup> : {}, <i>aur g<sup>1</sup> l</i> ; >quae possides, <i>ff<sup>1</sup></i>	Ait illi Iesus: si uis perfectus esse, uade, uende quae habes et da pauperibus et habebis thesaurum in caelo et ueni, sequere me.
19:22	Abiit tristis erat enim habens <b>possessiones multas.</b>	Abiit tristis erat enim habens <b>multas possessiones.</b>
19:23	Iesus autem dixit discipulis suis: amen dico uobis quia diues difficile intrabit in <b>regna</b> <sup>1</sup> caelorum.  <sup>1</sup> : >regno, <i>a b ff<sup>2</sup> n</i>	Iesus autem dixit discipulis suis: amen dico uobis quia diues difficile intrabit in <b>regnum</b> <sup>1</sup> caelorum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c d fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup></i>
19:24-6✕	Et iterum dico uobis: Facilius est camelum per foramen acus transire quam diuitem intrare in <b>regna</b> <sup>1</sup> caelorum.  { <b>quis ergo saluus fiet?</b> } <sup>3</sup>  (Quae) <b>apud homines</b> * <sup>4</sup> <b>impossibilia apud Deum</b> * <sup>5</sup> <b>possibilia sunt.</b>  <sup>1</sup> : >regno, <i>a ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> n</i> <sup>2</sup> : unique; >fieri, <i>ff<sup>2</sup></i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>om.</i> poterit/potest, unique <sup>4</sup> : <i>om.</i> hoc, unique <sup>5</sup> : <i>om.</i> autem omnia, unique	Et iterum dico uobis: Facilius est camelum per foramen acus transire quam diuitem intrare in <b>regnum</b> <sup>1</sup> caelorum.  { <b>quis ergo poterit saluus esse?</b> }  <b>apud homines hoc impossibile est apud Deum autem omnia possibilia sunt.</b>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur b c d f g<sup>1</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup></i>
19:27	Tunc respondens Petrus dixit ei: ecce nos reliquimus omnia et secuti sumus te; quid ergo erit nobis?	Tunc respondens Petrus dixit ei: ecce nos reliquimus omnia et secuti sumus te; quid ergo erit nobis?
19:28	Iesus autem dixit illis: amen dico uobis quod uos, qui secuti estis me, in regeneratione, cum sederit filius hominis in sede maiestatis suae, sedebitis {} <sup>1</sup> super sedes duodecim iudicantes duodecim tribus Israhel.  <sup>1</sup> : {}, <i>om.</i> et uos, unique. <i>om.</i> et, <i>n</i>	Iesus autem dixit illis: amen dico uobis quod uos, qui secuti estis me, in regeneratione, cum sederit Filius hominis in sede maiestatis suae, sedebitis <b>et uos</b> super sedes duodecim iudicantes duodecim tribus Israhel.
19:29-30	Et omnis qui reliquit domum uel fratres aut sorores aut patrem aut matrem aut uxorem <sup>1</sup> aut filios aut agros propter nomen meum, centuplum <b>recipiet</b> <sup>2</sup> et uitam aeternam possidebit. Multi autem erunt primi nouissimi et nouissimi primi.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c f g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i> <sup>2</sup> : unique	Et omnis qui reliquit domum uel fratres aut sorores aut patrem aut matrem aut uxorem aut filios aut agros propter nomen meum, centuplum <b>accipiet</b> et uitam aeternam possidebit. Multi autem erunt primi nouissimi et nouissimi primi.

20:1-2	<p>Simile est {}<sup>1</sup> regnum caelorum homini patri familias qui exiit primo mane conducere operarios in uineam suam.</p> <p>Conuentione autem facta cum operariis ex denario diurno misit eos in uineam suam.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>om. enim, aur b c ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup></i></p>	<p>Simile est <b>enim</b><sup>1</sup> regnum caelorum homini patri familias qui exiit primo mane conducere operarios in uineam suam.</p> <p>Conuentione autem facta cum operariis ex denario diurno misit eos in uineam suam</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>a d fff<sup>2</sup> l n q r<sup>1</sup>; &gt;autem, h</i></p>
20:13	<p>Amice non facio tibi iniuriam.</p> <p>Nonne ex denario conuenisti me cum?</p>	<p>Amice non facio tibi iniuriam.</p> <p>Nonne ex denario conuenisti me cum?</p>
20:14	Tolle quod tuum est et uade.	Tolle quod tuum est et uade.
20:15-6 ‡	<p>An oculus tuus nequam est quia ego bonus sum?</p> <p>Sic erunt, (inquit,) nouissimi primi et primi nouissimi; multi <b>enim sunt</b><sup>1</sup> uocati pauci autem electi.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>aur d fff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h; &gt;autem] sunt, q</i></p>	<p>An oculus tuus nequam est quia ego bonus sum?</p> <p>Sic erunt nouissimi primi et primi nouissimi; multi <b>sunt enim</b><sup>2</sup> uocati pauci autem electi.</p> <p><sup>2</sup>: <i>b c n; sunt &gt;autem, l</i></p>
20:17-9	<p>Et ascendens Iesus Hierosolymam adsumpsit duodecim discipulos suos et ait illis: Ecce ascendimus Hierosolymam, et Filius hominis tradetur principibus <b>seniorum</b><sup>1</sup> et scribis, et condemnabunt eum morte et tradent eum gentibus ad deludendum et flagellandum et crucifigendum, et tertia die resurget.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>unique</i></p>	<p>Et ascendens Iesus Hierosolymam adsumpsit duodecim discipulos secreto et ait illis: Ecce ascendimus Hierosolymam, et Filius hominis tradetur principibus <b>sacerdotum</b><sup>1</sup> et scribis, et condemnabunt eum morte et tradent eum gentibus ad deludendum et flagellandum et crucifigendum, et tertia die resurget.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>all options in Jülicher</i></p>
20:20-1	<p>Tunc accessit ad eum mater filiorum Zebedaei cum filiis suis adorans et petens aliquid ab eo. Qui dixit ei: Quid uis? Ait illi: Dic ut sedeant <b>hi</b><sup>1</sup> duo filii mei unus ad dexteram {}<sup>2</sup> et unus ad sinistram in regno tuo.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>b c d f n q</i> <sup>2</sup>: <i>om. tuam, unique</i></p>	<p>Tunc accessit ad eum mater filiorum Zebedaei cum filiis suis adorans et petens aliquid ab eo. Qui dixit ei: Quid vis? Ait illi: Dic ut sedeant <b>hii</b> duo filii mei unus ad dexteram <b>tuam</b> et unus ad sinistram in regno tuo.</p>
20:22	<p>Respondens autem Iesus dixit: nescitis quid petatis.</p> <p>Potestis bibere calicem quem ego bibiturus sum?</p>	<p>Respondens autem Iesus dixit: nescitis quid petatis.</p> <p>Potestis bibere calicem quem ego bibiturus sum?</p>
20:23	Ait illis: calicem quidem meum bibetis, sedere autem ad dexteram meam et <b>ad</b> sinistram non est meum dare uobis, sed quibus paratum est a Patre meo.	Ait illis: calicem quidem meum bibetis, sedere autem ad dexteram meam et sinistram non est meum dare uobis, sed quibus paratum est a Patre meo.

20:24	Et audientes decem indignati sunt de duobus fratribus.	Et audientes decem indignati sunt de duobus fratribus.
20:25	Iesus autem uocauit eos ad se et ait: scitis quia principes gentium dominantur eorum	Iesus autem uocauit eos ad se et ait: scitis quia principes gentium dominantur eorum.
20:28	Sicut Filius hominis non uenit ministrari sed ministrare.  Et dare animam suam redemptionem pro multis.	Sicut Filius hominis non uenit ministrari sed ministrare.  Et dare animam suam redemptionem pro multis.
20:29-31	Et egredientibus <b>illis</b> <sup>1</sup> ab Hiericho secuta est eum turba multa. Et ecce duo caeci sedentes secus uiam audierunt quia Iesus transiret, et clamauerunt dicentes: Domine miserere nostri Fili Daud. Turba autem increpabat eos ut tacerent. At illi magis clamabant dicentes: Domine miserere nostri* Fili Daud.  <sup>1</sup> : ff <sup>2</sup> h	Et egredientibus <b>eis</b> ab Hiericho secuta est eum turba multa. Et ecce duo caeci sedentes secus uiam audierunt quia Iesus transiret et clamauerunt dicentes: Domine miserere nostri Fili David. Turba autem increpabat eos ut tacerent. At illi magis clamabant dicentes: Domine miserere nostri* Fili David
20:32	Stetit Iesus et* uocauit eos et ait.	<b>Et</b> stetit Iesus et* uocauit eos et ait
20:34	Misertus autem eorum Iesus tetigit oculos eorum, et confestim uiderunt et secuti sunt eum.	Misertus autem eorum Iesus tetigit oculos eorum, et confestim uiderunt et secuti sunt eum.
21:1-3 <sup>14</sup>	Et cum adpropinquassent Hierosolymis et uenissent Bethfage ad montem Oliueti tunc Iesus misit duos discipulos dicens eis: ite in castellum quod contra uos est <b>ac</b> statim inuenietis asinam alligatam et pullum cum ea; soluete et adducite mihi et, si quis uobis aliquid dixerit, dicite: quia Dominus his opus habet, et confestim dimittet eos.	Et cum adpropinquassent Hierosolymis et uenissent Bethfage ad montem Oliueti tunc Iesus misit duos discipulos dicens eis: ite in castellum quod contra uos est <b>et</b> statim inuenietis asinam alligatam et pullum cum ea; soluete et adducite mihi et, si quis uobis aliquid dixerit, dicite: quia Dominus his opus habet, et confestim dimittet eos.
21:4-5	Hoc autem factum est ut impleretur quod dictum est per prophetam dicentem: dicite filiae Zion: ecce rex tuus uenit tibi mansuetus {} <sup>1</sup> sedens {super asinam et pullum} *filium subiugalis*.  <sup>1</sup> : om. et, a b d ff <sup>1</sup> ff <sup>2</sup> h	Hoc autem factum est ut impleretur quod dictum est per prophetam dicentem: dicite filiae Sion: ecce rex tuus uenit tibi mansuetus <b>et</b> <sup>1</sup> sedens {super asinam et pullum} *filium subiugalis*.  <sup>1</sup> : aur c f g <sup>1</sup> l q

<sup>14</sup> comment here on Greek translation. DC

21:6-7	Euntes autem discipuli fecerunt sicut praecepit <b>eis</b> <sup>1</sup> Iesus. Et adduxerunt asinam et pullum et inposuerunt super <b>eos</b> <sup>2</sup> uestimenta sua {et eum desuper sedere fecerunt} <sup>3</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>d</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>c g</i> <sup>1</sup> <sup>3</sup> : <i>{}, aur g</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>l</i>	Euntes autem discipuli fecerunt sicut praecepit <b>illis</b> <sup>1</sup> Iesus. Et adduxerunt asinam et pullum et inposuerunt super <b>eis</b> <sup>2</sup> uestimenta sua {et eum desuper sedere fecerunt}.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur b c f ff</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>g</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>h l q</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur l</i>
21:8	Plurima autem turba strauerunt uestimenta sua in uia.  Alii autem caedebant ramos de arboribus et sternebant in uia.	Plurima autem turba strauerunt uestimenta sua in uia.  Alii autem caedebant ramos de arboribus et sternebant in uia.
21:9 <sup>15</sup> †	Turbae autem quae praecedebant et quae sequebantur clamabant dicentes: osanna Filio Daud, benedictus qui uenturus est in nomine Domini, osanna in <b>excelsis</b> <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c d f g</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>h</i>	Turbae autem quae praecedebant et quae sequebantur clamabant dicentes: osanna Filio David, benedictus qui uenturus est in nomine Domini osanna in <b>altissimis</b> <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b ff</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>l q</i>
21:10	Et cum intrasset Hierosolymam commota est uniuersa ciuitas dicens: quis est hic?	Et cum intrasset Hierosolymam commota est universa civitas dicens: quis est hic?
21:11	Hic est Iesus propheta a Nazareth Galileae.	Hic est Iesus propheta a Nazareth Galilaeae.
21:12-3 ✕	Et intrauit Iesus in templum Dei et eiciebat omnes uendentes et ementes in templo et mensas nummulariorum et <b>cathedras columbas uendentium subuertit</b> <sup>1</sup> et dicit eis: scriptum est: Domus mea domus orationis uocabitur, uos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronum.  <sup>1</sup> : ~unique; subuertit, <i>aur ff</i> <sup>1</sup>	Et intrauit Iesus in templum Dei et eiciebat omnes uendentes et ementes in templo et mensas nummulariorum et <b>cathedras uendentium columbas euertit</b> et dicit eis: scriptum est: Domus mea domus orationis uocabitur, uos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronum.
21:14	Et accesserunt ad eum caeci et claudi in templo, et sanauit eos.	Et accesserunt ad eum caeci et claudi in templo, et sanauit eos.
21:15-6	Uidentes autem principes sacerdotum et scribae mirabilia quae fecit et pueros clamantes in templo et dicentes: Osanna Filio Daud, indignati sunt et dixerunt ei: audis quid isti dicant?	Uidentes autem principes sacerdotum et scribae mirabilia quae fecit et pueros clamantes in templo et dicentes: Osanna Filio David, indignati sunt et dixerunt ei: audis quid isti dicant?

<sup>15</sup> Excelsis/altissimis is a central VL v Vulgate difference. While *supersubstantialis* may superficially tie Jerome to the Vulgate, *excelsis* here accomplishes the opposite effect.

21:16	Iesus autem dicit <b>illis</b> <sup>1</sup> : utique; numquam legistis quia ex ore infantium et lactantium perficisti laudem?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b c ff<sup>1</sup> h</i>	Iesus autem dicit <b>eis</b> <sup>1</sup> : utique; numquam legistis quia ex ore infantium et lactantium perfecisti laudem?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>d f ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>
21:17	Et relictis illis abiit foras extra ciuitatem in Bethaniam ibi que mansit.	Et relictis illis abiit foras extra civitatem in Bethaniam ibique mansit.
21:18-20	Mane autem reuertens in ciuitatem esuriit et uidens fici arborem unam secus uiam, uenit ad eam et nihil inuenit in ea nisi folia tantum. Et ait illi: numquam ex te fructus nascatur in sempiternum. Et arefacta est continuo ficulnea. Et uidentes discipuli mirati sunt dicentes: quomodo continuo aruit?	Mane autem reuertens in ciuitatem esuriit et uidens fici arborem unam secus uiam, uenit ad eam et nihil inuenit in ea nisi folia tantum. Et {} ait illi: numquam ex te fructus nascatur in sempiternum. Et arefacta est continuo ficulnea. Et uidentes discipuli mirati sunt dicentes: quomodo continuo aruit?
21:21	Respondens autem Iesus ait eis: Amen dico uobis: si habueritis fidem et non haesitaueritis, non solum de ficulnea facietis sed et si monti dixeritis: tolle et iacta te in mare, fiet.	Respondens autem Iesus ait eis: Amen dico uobis: si habueritis fidem et non haesitaueritis, non solum de ficulnea facietis sed et si monti <b>huic</b> dixeritis: tolle et iacta te in mare, fiet.
21:23	Et cum uenisset in templum accesserunt ad eum docentem principes sacerdotum et seniores populi dicentes: in qua potestate haec facis et quis tibi dedit hanc potestatem?	Et cum uenisset in templum accesserunt ad eum docentem principes sacerdotum et seniores populi dicentes: in qua potestate haec facis et quis tibi dedit hanc potestatem?
21:24-5	Respondens Iesus dixit illis: Interrogabo uos et ego unum sermonem quem, si dixeritis mihi, et ego uobis dicam in qua potestate haec facio. Baptismum Iohannis unde erat, <b>de</b> <sup>1</sup> caelo an ex hominibus?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a b c d ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> h q r<sup>1</sup></i>	Respondens Iesus dixit illis: Interrogabo uos et ego unum sermonem quem, si dixeritis mihi, et ego uobis dicam in qua potestate haec facio. Baptismum Iohannis unde erat, <b>e</b> <sup>1</sup> caelo an ex hominibus?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur f g<sup>1</sup></i>
21:27	Ait illis et ipse: nec ego dico uobis in qua potestate haec facio.	Ait illis et ipse: nec ego dico uobis in qua potestate haec facio.

21:28-32	<p>Quid autem uobis uidetur? Homo habebat duos filios et accedens ad primum dixit: uade hodie operare in <b>uineam meam</b>. Ille autem respondens ait: Nolo, postea <b>uero</b> paenitentia motus abiit. Accedens autem ad alterum dixit similiter. At ille respondens ait: Eo Domine, et non iuit.</p> <p>Amen dico uobis quia publicani et meretrices praecedunt uos in regno Dei.</p> <p>Uenit enim ad uos Iohannes in uia iustitiae, et non credidistis ei, publicani autem et meretrices crediderunt.</p> <p>Quis ex duobus fecit uoluntatem patris? <b>Et illi</b><sup>1</sup> dicunt nouissimus.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: unique; +ei, d g<sup>1</sup> l</p>	<p>Quid autem uobis uidetur? Homo habebat duos filios et accedens ad primum dixit: <b>fili</b> uade hodie operare in <b>uinea mea</b>. Ille autem respondens ait: Nolo, postea <b>autem</b> paenitentia motus abiit. Accedens autem ad alterum dixit similiter. At ille respondens ait: Eo Domine et non iuit.</p> <p>Amen dico uobis quia publicani et meretrices praecedunt uos in regno Dei.</p> <p>Uenit enim ad uos Iohannes in uia iustitiae, et non credidistis ei, publicani autem et meretrices crediderunt.</p> <p>Quis ex duobus fecit uoluntatem patris? Dicunt nouissimus.</p>
21:33	<p>Aliam parabolam audite: homo erat paterfamilias qui plantauit uineam et <b>saepem</b> circumdedit et fodit in ea torcular et aedificauit turrem et locauit eam agricolis et peregre profectus est.</p>	<p>Aliam parabolam audite: homo erat paterfamilias qui plantauit uineam et <b>sepem</b><sup>1</sup> circumdedit <b>ei</b> et fodit in ea torcular et aedificauit turrem et locauit eam agricolis et peregre profectus est.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: unique (?) to Vulgate</p>
21:34-5	<p>Cum autem tempus fructuum adpropinquasset misit seruos suos ad agricolas ut acciperent fructus eius, et agricolae adprehensis seruis eius alium ceciderunt, alium occiderunt, alium uero lapidauerunt.</p>	<p>Cum autem tempus fructuum adpropinquasset misit seruos suos ad agricolas ut acciperent fructus eius, et agricolae adprehensis seruis eius alium ceciderunt, alium occiderunt, alium uero lapidauerunt.</p>
21:37,36	<p>Nouissime autem misit ad eos filium suum dicens: uerebuntur filium meum.</p> <p>Iterum misit alios seruos plures prioribus, et fecerunt illis similiter.</p>	<p>Nouissime autem misit ad eos filium suum dicens: uerebuntur filium meum.</p> <p>Iterum misit alios seruos plures prioribus, et fecerunt illis similiter.</p>
21:39	<p>Adprehensum eum ieicerunt extra uineam et occiderunt.</p>	<p>Adprehensum eum ieicerunt extra uineam et occiderunt.</p>
21:40 <sup>16</sup>	<p>Cum ergo uenerit dominus uineae quid faciet <b>colonis</b><sup>1</sup> illis.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: a b c d ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> h q r<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>Cum ergo enerit dominus uineae quid faciet <b>agricolis</b><sup>1</sup> illis.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: aur f g<sup>1</sup> altialtis/</p>

<sup>16</sup> Augustine Sermon 87: cum uenerit dominus uineae, quid faciet illis malis colonis?



21:42	Dicit illis Iesus: numquam legistis in scripturis: lapidem quem reprobauerunt aedificantes hic factus est in caput anguli; a Domino factum est istud, <b>hoc</b> est mirabile in oculis nostris.	Dicit illis Iesus: numquam legistis in scripturis: lapidem quem reprobauerunt aedificantes hic factus est in caput anguli; a Domino factum est istud, <b>et</b> est mirabile in oculis nostris.
21:43	Ideo dico uobis quia auferetur a uobis regnum Dei et dabitur genti facienti fructus eius.	Ideo dico uobis quia auferetur a uobis regnum Dei et dabitur genti facienti fructus eius.
21:44	Qui ceciderit super lapidem istum confringetur, super quem uero ceciderit conteret eum. <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : present in, <i>aur c f g<sup>1</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup></i> ; a near word for word (Greek) interpolation of Luke 20:18	Qui ceciderit super lapidem istum confringetur, super quem uero ceciderit conteret eum.
21:45-6	Et cum audissent principes sacerdotum et Pharisei parabolas eius, cognouerunt quod de ipsis diceret et quaerentes eum tenere, timuerunt turbas, quoniam sicut prophetam eum habebant.	Et cum audissent principes sacerdotum et Pharisei parabolas eius, cognouerunt quod de ipsis diceret et quaerentes eum tenere, timuerunt turbas, quoniam sicut prophetam eum habebant.
22:1-3	Et respondens Iesus {dixit in parabolis eis dicens} <sup>1</sup> : simile factum est regnum caelorum homini regi qui fecit nuptias filio suo et misit <b>seruum suum</b> <sup>2</sup> uocare inuitatos ad nuptias, et <b>noluerunt</b> <sup>3</sup> uenire.  <sup>1</sup> : unique order; <i>om.</i> iterum, unique <sup>2</sup> : unique <sup>3</sup> : <i>aur b c f f f<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h q r<sup>1</sup></i>	Et respondens Iesus dixit <b>iterum</b> in parabolis eis dicens: simile factum est regnum caelorum homini regi qui fecit nuptias filio suo et misit <b>seruos suos</b> <sup>2</sup> uocare inuitatos ad nuptias, et <b>nolebant</b> <sup>3</sup> uenire  <sup>2</sup> : <i>a aur b c d f f f<sup>1</sup> f f<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup></i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>d l</i>
22:4	Iterum misit alios seruos dicens: dicite inuitatis: ecce prandium meum paraui, tauri mei et altilia occisa et omnia parata, uenite ad nuptias.	Iterum misit alios seruos dicens: dicite inuitatis: ecce prandium meum paraui, tauri mei et altilia occisa et omnia parata, uenite ad nuptias.
22:5-6	Et abierunt alius* in uillam suam alius* ad negotiationem <sup>1</sup> {}, <b>alii</b> <sup>2</sup> uero tenuerunt seruos eius et contumelia adfectos occiderunt.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om.</i> suam, unique <sup>2</sup> : >alii, unique	Et abierunt alius* in uillam suam alius* <b>uero</b> ad negotiationem <b>suam</b> , <b>reliqui</b> <sup>2</sup> uero tenuerunt seruos eius et contumelia adfectos occiderunt.  <sup>2</sup> : >reliqui, <i>a b c d f f f<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>

22:7	Rex autem cum audisset iratus est.  Et missis exercitibus suis perdidit homicidas illos et ciuitatem illorum succendit.	Rex autem cum audisset iratus est.  Et missis exercitibus suis perdidit homicidas illos et ciuitatem illorum succendit.
22:8-9	Tunc ait seruis suis: nuptiae quidem paratae sunt, sed qui inuitati erant non fuerunt digni; ite ergo ad exitus uiarum et quoscumque inueneritis uocate ad nuptias.	Tunc ait seruis suis: nuptiae quidem paratae sunt, sed qui inuitati erant non fuerunt digni; ite ergo ad exitus uiarum et quoscumque inueneritis uocate ad nuptias.
22:11-2	Intrauit autem rex ut uideret discumbentes et uidit ibi hominem non uestitum ueste nuptiali et ait illi: Amice quomodo huc intrasti non habens uestem* nuptialem? At ille obmutuit.	Intrauit autem rex ut uideret discumbentes et uidit ibi hominem non uestitum ueste nuptiali et ait illi: Amice quomodo huc intrasti non habens uestem* nuptialem? At ille obmutuit.
22:13	Tunc dixit rex ministris: ligatis pedibus eius et manibus mittite eum in tenebras exteriores; ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium.	Tunc dixit rex ministris: ligatis pedibus eius et manibus mittite eum in tenebras exteriores; ibi erit fletus et stridor dentium.
22:14	Multi autem sunt uocati pauci uero electi.	Multi autem sunt uocati pauci uero electi.
22:15-6	Tunc abeuntes Pharisei consilium inierunt ut caperent eum in sermone et mittunt {} discipulos suos cum Herodianis dicentes:  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om., b ff<sup>1</sup> q</i>	Tunc abeuntes Pharisei consilium inierunt ut caperent eum in sermone et mittunt <b>ei</b> <sup>1</sup> discipulos suos cum Herodianis dicentes:  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur g<sup>1</sup> h l</i>
22:16-7	Magister scimus quia uerax es et uiam Dei in ueritate doces et {non est tibi cura de aliquo}; non enim respicis personam hominum. *Dic ergo nobis* <sup>1</sup> quid tibi uidetur: licet census dare Caesari annon?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c f g<sup>1</sup> h l</i>	Magister scimus quia uerax es et uiam Dei in ueritate doces et {non est tibi cura de aliquo}; non enim respicis personam hominum. *Dic ergo nobis* quid tibi uideatur: licet census dare Caesari annon?
22:18	Cognita autem Iesus nequitia eorum ait: quid me temptatis hypocritae?	Cognita autem Iesus nequitia eorum ait: quid me temptatis hypocritae?
22:19	Ostendite mihi <b>numisma</b> census. At illi obtulerunt ei denarium.	Ostendite mihi <b>nomisma</b> census. At illi obtulerunt ei denarium.
22:20	Et ait illis Iesus: cuius est imago haec et <b>superscriptio</b> <sup>1</sup> ?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b c f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> h l q</i>	Et ait illis Iesus: cuius est imago haec et <b>suprascriptio</b> <sup>1</sup> ?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>g<sup>1</sup> l</i>

22:21	Dicunt ei: Caesaris. Tunc ait illis: Reddite ergo <sup>1</sup> quae sunt Caesaris Caesari et quae sunt Dei Deo.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i>	Dicunt ei: Caesaris. Tunc ait illis: Reddite ergo quae sunt Caesaris Caesari et quae sunt Dei Deo.
22:22	Et {} <sup>1</sup> audientes mirati sunt.  Et relicto eo abierunt.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. illi, aur d fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>	Et audientes mirati sunt.  Et relicto eo abierunt.
22:23	In illo die accesserunt ad eum Sadducaei qui dicunt non esse resurrectionem.	In illo die accesserunt ad eum Sadducaei qui dicunt non esse resurrectionem.
22:23-5	Et interrogauerunt eum dicentes: Magister, <b>Moyses</b> dixit: Si quis mortuus fuerit non habens filium ut ducat frater eius uxorem illius et suscitet semen fratri suo. Erant autem apud nos septem fratres, et primus uxore ducta defunctus est.	Et interrogauerunt eum dicentes: Magister <b>Moses</b> <sup>1</sup> dixit: Si quis mortuus fuerit non habens filium ut ducat frater eius uxorem illius et suscitet semen fratri suo. Erant autem apud nos septem fratres, et primus uxore ducta defunctus est.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>g<sup>1</sup></i>
22:28	In resurrectione ergo cuius erit de septem uxor? Omnes enim habuerunt eam.	In resurrectione ergo cuius erit de septem uxor? Omnes enim habuerunt eam.
22:29	Respondens {} <sup>1</sup> Iesus ait illis: erratis nescientes scripturas neque uirtutem Dei.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. autem, b ff<sup>2</sup> h r<sup>1</sup></i>	Respondens <b>autem</b> <sup>1</sup> Iesus ait illis: erratis nescientes scripturas neque uirtutem Dei.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c d fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>
22:30	In resurrectione enim neque nubent neque nubentur <sup>1</sup> .  Sed sunt sicut angeli Dei in caelo.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l (r<sup>1</sup>); -untur, d h</i>	In resurrectione enim neque nubent neque nubentur.  Sed sunt sicut angeli Dei in caelo.
22:31-2	De resurrectione autem mortuorum non legistis quod dictum est a Deo dicente uobis: Ego sum Deus Abraham et Deus Isaac et Deus Iacob? Non est Deus mortuorum sed uiuentium.	De resurrectione autem mortuorum non legistis quod dictum est a Deo dicente uobis: Ego sum Deus Abraham et Deus Isaac et Deus Iacob? Non est Deus mortuorum sed uiuentium.
22:34-7	Pharisaei {} <sup>1</sup> <b>audito</b> <sup>2</sup> quod silentium inposuisset Sadducaeis conuenerunt in unum; et interrogauit eum unus ex eis legis doctor temptans eum: Magister, quod est mandatum magnum in lege? Ait illi Iesus: Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om. autem, unique</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>unique</i>	Pharisaei <b>autem audientes</b> quod silentium inposuisset Sadducaeis conuenerunt in unum; et interrogauit eum unus ex eis legis doctor temptans eum: Magister, quod est mandatum magnum in lege? Ait illi Iesus: Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo.

22:41-4	Congregatis autem [Pharisaeis interrogauit eos Iesus dicens: Quid] uobis uidetur de Christo? Cuius filius est? Dicunt ei: Daudid. Ait illis: Quomodo ergo Daudid in spiritu uocat eum Dominum dicens: Dixit Dominus Domino meo: sede a dextris meis donec ponam inimicos tuos {scabillum pedum tuorum}?	Congregatis autem [Pharisaeis interrogauit eos Iesus dicens: Quid] uobis uidetur de Christo? Cuius filius est? Dicunt ei: Daudid. Ait illis: Quomodo ergo David in spiritu uocat eum Dominum dicens: Dixit Dominus Domino meo: sede a dextris meis donec ponam inimicos tuos {scabillum pedum tuorum}?
22:46	Et nemo poterat respondere ei uerbum neque ausus fuit quisquam ex illa die eum amplius interrogare.	Et nemo poterat respondere ei uerbum neque ausus fuit quisquam ex illa die eum amplius interrogare.
23:1-3	Tunc Iesus locutus est ad turbas et discipulos suos dicens: super cathedram <b>Moysi</b> sederunt scribae et Phariseae; omnia {ergo <b>quae</b> dixerint uobis seruare et facite, secundum opera uero eorum nolite facere}; dicunt enim et non faciunt.	Tunc Iesus locutus est ad turbas et discipulos suos dicens: super cathedram <b>Mosi</b> <sup>1</sup> sederunt scribae et Phariseae; omnia {ergo <b>quaecumque</b> dixerint uobis seruare et facite, secundum opera uero eorum nolite facere}; dicunt enim et non faciunt.  <sup>1</sup> : g <sup>1</sup>
23:4	Alligant autem onera grauia {et <b>importabilia</b> } <sup>1</sup> et <b>imponunt</b> <sup>2</sup> in <b>humeros</b> hominum, digito autem suo nolunt ea mouere.  <sup>1</sup> : {}, aur c (d) fff <sup>1</sup> g <sup>1</sup> l q <sup>2</sup> : aur h	Alligant autem onera grauia {et <b>inportabilia</b> } et <b>inponunt</b> in <b>umeros</b> hominum, digito autem suo nolunt ea mouere.
23:5	Omnia uero opera sua faciunt ut uideantur ab hominibus.	Omnia uero opera sua faciunt ut uideantur ab hominibus.
23:5-7	Dilatant enim phylacteria sua et magnificent fimbrias; amant <b>quoque</b> <sup>1</sup> primos recubitus <sup>2</sup> in cenis et primas cathedras in synagogis et salutationes in foro et uocari ab hominibus rabbi.  <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : aur ff <sup>1</sup> g <sup>1</sup> ; > <b>primum recubitum</b> , b q	Dilatant enim phylacteria sua et magnificent fimbrias; amant <b>autem</b> <sup>1</sup> primos recubitus in cenis et primas cathedras in synagogis et salutationes in foro et uocari ab hominibus rabbi.  <sup>1</sup> : a aur b c d fff <sup>1</sup> ff <sup>2</sup> g <sup>1</sup> q r <sup>1</sup>
23:8-10	Uos autem nolite uocari rabbi, unus <b>est enim</b> magister uester, et patrem nolite uocare uobis super terram, <b>unus est enim</b> Pater uester qui in caelis est, nec uocemini magistri quia magister uester unus* est Christus.	Uos autem nolite uocari rabbi, unus <b>enim est</b> magister uester, { <b>omnes autem uos fratres estis</b> } <sup>1</sup> et patrem nolite uocare uobis super terram, <b>unus enim est</b> Pater uester qui in caelis est, nec uocemini magistri quia magister uester unus* est Christus.  <sup>1</sup> : all

23:13	<p>Uae {}<sup>1</sup> uobis scribae et Pharisei hypocritae quia clauditis regnum caelorum ante homines; uos <b>ipsi</b><sup>2</sup> non intratis nec introeuntes sinitis intrare.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: {} <i>om. autem, fh</i>  <sup>2</sup>: unique</p>	<p>Uae <b>autem</b> uobis scribae et Pharisei hypocritae quia clauditis regnum caelorum ante homines; uos <b>enim</b> non intratis nec introeuntes sinitis intrare</p>
23:15	<p>Uae uobis scribae et Pharisei hypocritae quia circuitis mare et aridam, ut faciatis unum proselytum et, cum fuerit factus, facitis eum filium gehennae duplo quam uos.</p>	<p>Uae uobis scribae et Pharisei hypocritae quia circuitis mare et aridam, ut faciatis unum proselytum et, cum fuerit factus, facitis eum filium gehennae duplo quam uos.</p>
23:16-22	<p>Uae uobis duces caeci qui dicitis: quicumque iurauerit per templum nihil est, qui autem iurauerit in <b>auro</b><sup>1</sup> templi debet. Stulti et caeci, quid enim maius est: aurum an templum quod sanctificat aurum? Et qui cumque iurauerit in altari nihil est, {quicumque autem} iurauerit in dono quod est super illud debet. Caeci, quid enim maius est: donum an altare quod sanctificat donum? Qui ergo <b>*in altari iurat, iurat*</b><sup>2</sup> in eo et in omnibus quae super illud sunt; et qui iurauerit in templo, iurat in illo et in eo qui <b>habitat</b><sup>3</sup> in ipso; et qui iurat in caelo, iurat in throno Dei et in eo qui sedet super eum.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>a aur b d ff<sup>2</sup> h q</i>  <sup>2</sup>: none identical, in this order. altari, <i>a</i>  <sup>3</sup>: <i>c f ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h r<sup>1</sup></i></p>	<p>Uae uobis duces caeci qui dicitis: quicumque iurauerit per templum nihil est, qui autem iurauerit in <b>aurum</b><sup>1</sup> templi debet. Stulti et caeci, quid enim maius est: aurum an templum quod sanctificat aurum? Et qui cumque iurauerit in altari nihil est, {quicumque autem} iurauerit in dono quod est super illud debet. Caeci, quid enim maius est: donum an altare quod sanctificat donum? Qui ergo <b>*iurat in altare<sup>2</sup> iurat*</b>, in eo et in omnibus quae super illud sunt; et qui iurauerit in templo, iurat in illo et in eo qui <b>inhabitat</b><sup>3</sup> in ipso; et qui iurat in caelo, iurat in throno Dei et in eo qui sedet super eum.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>c f ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>  <sup>2</sup>: altare, <i>aur c d f ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l r<sup>1</sup></i>  <sup>3</sup>: <i>ff<sup>1</sup> l</i></p>
23:23	<p>Uae uobis, scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, quia decimatis mentam et <b>anetum</b> et cyminum et reliquistis quae grauiora sunt legis iudicium et misericordiam et fidem; haec oportuit facere et illa non omittere.</p>	<p>Uae uobis, scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, quia decimatis mentam et <b>anethum</b> et cyminum et reliquistis quae grauiora sunt legis iudicium et misericordiam et fidem; haec oportuit facere et illa non omittere.</p>
23:24	<p>Duces caeci excolantes<sup>1</sup> culicem, camelum autem <b>glutientes</b>.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>f ff<sup>1</sup> l</i></p>	<p>Duces caeci excolantes culicem, camelum autem <b>gluttientes</b></p>
23:25-6	<p>Uae uobis, scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, quia mundatis quod de foris est calicis et parapsidis, intus autem pleni <b>estis</b><sup>1</sup> rapina et inmunditia<sup>2</sup>. Phariseae caece, munda prius quod intus est calicis {et parapsidis}<sup>3</sup>, ut fiat id quod foris* est mundum.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>c f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> m.2 l m.2</i>  <sup>2</sup>: <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>  <sup>3</sup>: {}, <i>aur c f ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l</i></p>	<p>Uae uobis, scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, quia mundatis quod de foris est calicis et parapsidis, intus autem pleni <b>sunt</b><sup>1</sup> rapina et inmunditia<sup>2</sup>. Phariseae caece, munda prius quod intus est calicis {et parapsidis}<sup>3</sup>, ut fiat <b>et</b><sup>4</sup> id quod <b>de</b><sup>5</sup> foris* est mundum</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>aur l r<sup>1</sup></i>; ~sunt pleni, <i>g<sup>1</sup></i>  <sup>2</sup>: see previous cell  <sup>3</sup>: see previous cell  <sup>4</sup>: <i>om. c ff<sup>1</sup> h</i>  <sup>5</sup>: <i>om. c d</i></p>

23:27	Uae uobis, scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, quia similes estis sepulchris dealbatis quae a foris parent hominibus speciosa, intus uero plena sunt ossibus mortuorum et omni spurcitia.	Uae uobis, scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, quia similes estis sepulchris dealbatis quae a foris parent hominibus speciosa, intus uero plena sunt ossibus mortuorum et omni spurcitia.
23:28-31	Sic et uos a foris quidem paretis hominibus iusti, intus autem pleni estis hypocrisi et iniquitate. Uae uobis, scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, quia aedificatis sepulchra prophetarum et ornatis monumenta iustorum et dicitis: si fuissetis in diebus patrum nostrorum, non <b>fuissemus</b> <sup>1</sup> socii eorum in sanguine prophetarum. Itaque testimonio estis uobismet ipsis quia filii estis eorum qui prophetas occiderunt.  <sup>1</sup> : seemingly unique	Sic et uos a foris quidem paretis hominibus iusti, intus autem pleni estis hypocrisi et iniquitate. Uae uobis, scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, quia aedificatis sepulchra prophetarum et ornatis monumenta iustorum et dicitis: si fuissetis in diebus patrum nostrorum, non <b>essemus</b> socii eorum in sanguine prophetarum. Itaque testimonio estis uobismet ipsis quia filii estis eorum qui prophetas occiderunt.
23:32	Et uos implete mensuram patrum uestrorum.	Et uos implete mensuram patrum uestrorum.
23:33	Serpentes genimina uiperarum quomodo fugietis a iudicio gehennae?	Serpentes genimina viperarum quomodo fugietis a iudicio gehennae
23:34	Ideo ecce ego mitto ad uos prophetas et sapientes et scribas, ex illis occidetis et crucifigietis {et ex eis flagellabitis in synagogis uestris} <sup>1</sup> et <b>persequimini</b> de ciuitate in ciuitatem.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c f f<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup></i> , ex illis, <i>l q r<sup>1</sup></i> ; <i>om. uestris, r<sup>1</sup></i>	Ideo ecce ego mitto ad uos prophetas et sapientes et scribas, ex illis occidetis et crucifigietis {et ex eis flagellabitis in synagogis uestris} et <b>persequemini</b> de ciuitate in ciuitatem.
23:35-6	Ut ueniat super uos omnis sanguis iustus qui effusus est super terram a sanguine Abel iusti usque ad sanguinem Zachariae filii Barachiae <b>qui occisus est</b> <sup>1</sup> inter templum et altare. <sup>17</sup> Amen dico uobis, uenient haec omnia super generationem istam.  <sup>1</sup> : seemingly unique	Ut ueniat super uos omnis sanguis iustus qui effusus est super terram a sanguine Abel iusti usque ad sanguinem Zachariae filii Barachiae <b>quem occidisti</b> <sup>1</sup> inter templum et altare. Amen dico uobis, uenient haec omnia super generationem istam.  <sup>1</sup> : universal, save <i>ff<sup>2</sup></i> (quem occidisti)
23:37	Hierusalem Hierusalem quae occidis prophetas et lapidas eos qui {ad te missi sunt}, quotiens uolui congregare filios tuos quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos suos sub alas, et noluisti.	Hierusalem Hierusalem quae occidis prophetas et lapidas eos qui {ad te missi sunt}, quotiens uolui congregare filios tuos quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos suos sub alas, et noluisti.

<sup>17</sup> Greek: ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξύ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.

23:38 ‡	Ecce <b>relinquetur</b> <sup>1</sup> uobis domus uestra deserta.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i>	Ecce <b>relinquitur</b> <sup>1</sup> uobis domus uestra deserta.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b ff<sup>2</sup></i>
23:39	Dico enim <sup>1</sup> uobis: non me uidebitis amodo donec dicatis: benedictus qui uenit in nomine Domini.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur d ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>	Dico enim uobis: non me uidebitis amodo donec dicatis: benedictus qui uenit in nomine Domini
24:1-2	Et egressus Iesus de templo ibat. Et accesserunt <b>ad eum</b> <sup>1</sup> discipuli eius ut ostenderent ei <b>aedificia</b> <sup>2</sup> templi. Ipse autem respondens dixit <b>illis</b> <sup>3</sup> : uidetis haec omnia? Amen dico uobis: non relinquetur hic lapis super lapidem qui non destruat.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c f</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>f</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>Jülicher, a b c ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h</i>	Et egressus Iesus de templo ibat. Et accesserunt discipuli eius ut ostenderent ei <b>aedificationes</b> <sup>2</sup> templi. Ipse autem respondens dixit <b>eis</b> <sup>3</sup> : uidetis haec omnia? Amen dico uobis: non relinquetur hic lapis super lapidem qui non destruat.  <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>aur d f l g (r<sup>1</sup>)</i>
24:3	Sedente autem eo super montem Oliueti accesserunt ad eum discipuli secreto dicentes: dic nobis quando haec erunt et quod signum aduentus tui et consummationis saeculi?	Sedente autem eo super montem Oliueti accesserunt ad eum discipuli secreto dicentes: dic nobis quando haec erunt et quod signum aduentus tui et consummationis saeculi?
24:6	{Audituri <b>enim</b> estis} <sup>1</sup> proelia et opiniones proeliorum uidete ne turbemini; oportet enim haec fieri, sed nondum est finis.  <sup>1</sup> : {}, g <sup>1</sup> ; audietis enim, h r <sup>1</sup>	{Audituri <b>autem</b> estis} <sup>1</sup> proelia et opiniones proeliorum uidete ne turbemini; oportet enim haec fieri, sed nondum est finis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur f ff<sup>1</sup> l</i>
24:7-8	<b>Surget</b> <sup>1</sup> enim gens <b>contra</b> <sup>2</sup> gentem et regnum <b>contra</b> <sup>3</sup> regnum, et erunt pestilentiae et fames et terrae motus per loca; haec {} <sup>4</sup> omnia initia sunt dolorum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>h (insurget, Jülicher)</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>Jülicher</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>Jülicher</i> <sup>4</sup> : unique omission in this order. ~omnia haec <i>Jülicher</i>	<b>Consurget</b> <sup>1</sup> enim gens <b>in</b> <sup>2</sup> gentem et regnum <b>in</b> <sup>3</sup> regnum, et erunt pestilentiae et fames et terrae motus per loca; haec <b>autem</b> <sup>4</sup> omnia initia sunt dolorum  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup>; (-ent) l</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i> <sup>4</sup> : <i>aur c f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>
24:9	Tunc tradent uos in <b>tribulatione</b> et occident uos.	Tunc tradent uos in <b>tribulationem</b> et occident uos.
24:12	Et quoniam <b>abundauit</b> <sup>1</sup> iniquitas refrigescet caritas multorum. [Ep. 52.4]  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>	Et quoniam <b>abundabit</b> <sup>1</sup> iniquitas refrigescet caritas multorum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a b f h r<sup>1</sup></i>
24:14	Et praedicabitur hoc euangelium regni {in uniuerso orbe} in testimonium omnibus gentibus, et tunc ueniet consummatio.	Et praedicabitur hoc euangelium regni {in uniuerso orbe} in testimonium omnibus gentibus, et tunc ueniet consummatio
24:15	Cum ergo uideritis abominationem desolationis quae dicta est a Danihelo propheta stantem in loco sancto; qui legit intellegat.	Cum ergo uideritis abominationem desolationis quae dicta est a Danihelo propheta stantem in loco sancto; qui legit intellegat.

24:16-8	Tunc qui in Iudaea sunt fugiant ad montes {et qui in tecto} non descendat tollere aliquid de domo sua <sup>1</sup> , et qui in agro non reuertatur tollere tunicam suam.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l (r<sup>1</sup>?)</i>	Tunc qui in Iudaea sunt fugiant ad montes {et qui in tecto} non descendat tollere aliquid de domo sua, et qui in agro non reuertatur tollere tunicam suam.
24:19	Uae autem praegnantibus et nutrientibus <sup>1</sup> in illis diebus.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c fff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup> (e)</i>	Uae autem praegnatibus et nutrientibus in illis diebus.
24:20	Orate autem ut non fiat fuga uestra hieme uel sabbato.	Orate autem ut non fiat fuga uestra hieme uel sabbato.
24:22	Et nisi breuitati fuissent dies illi, non fieret salua omnis caro, {sed propter electos} breuiabuntur dies illi.	Et nisi breuiati fuissent dies illi, non fieret salua omnis caro, {sed propter electos} breuiabuntur dies illi.
24:23	Tunc si quis uobis dixerit: ecce hic Christus aut illic, nolite credere.	Tunc si quis uobis dixerit: ecce hic Christus aut illic, nolite credere.
24:24-5	Surgent enim pseudochristi et pseudoprophetae et dabunt signa magna et prodigia ita ut in errorem inducantur, si fieri potest, etiam electi. Ecce praedixi uobis.	Surgent enim pseudochristi et pseudoprophetae et dabunt signa magna et prodigia ita ut in errorem inducantur, si fieri potest, etiam electi. Ecce praedixi uobis.
24:26	Si ergo dixerint uobis: ecce in deserto est, nolite exire. Ecce in <b>penetralibus</b> <sup>1</sup> , nolite credere.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a b ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h</i>	Si ergo dixerint uobis: ecce in deserto est, nolite exire. Ecce in <b>penetrabilibus</b> <sup>1</sup> nolite credere.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fl</i>
24:27	Sicut enim <b>fulgor</b> exit ab oriente et paret usque in <b>occidentem</b> ita erit et aduentus Filii hominis.	Sicut enim <b>fulgor</b> exit ab oriente et paret usque in <b>occidente</b> <sup>1</sup> ita erit et aduentus Filii hominis  <sup>1</sup> : <i>fl</i>
24:28	Ubi cumque fuerit corpus illuc congregabuntur aquilae.	Ubi cumque fuerit corpus illuc congregabuntur aquilae.
24:29	Statim autem post tribulationem dierum illorum sol obscurabitur, et luna non dabit lumen suum, et stellae <b>caeli</b> <sup>1</sup> cadent de caelo, et uirtutes caelorum commouebuntur.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Statim autem post tribulationem dierum illorum sol obscurabitur, et luna non dabit lumen suum, et stellae cadent de caelo, et uirtutes caelorum commovebuntur.
24:30	Et tunc parebit signum Filii hominis in caelo.  Tunc plangent omnes tribus terrae.	Et tunc parebit signum Filii hominis in caelo.  Tunc plangent omnes tribus terrae.
24:31	Et mittet angelos suos cum tuba.	Et mittet angelos suos cum tuba.



24:32-3	Ab arbore <b>ficus</b> discite parabolam. Cum iam ramus eius tener fuerit et folia nata scitis quia prope est aestas.  {Cum haec omnia (quae scripta sunt) uideritis  Quod prope sit et in ianuis.} <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : heavily paraphrased	Ab arbore <b>autem fici</b> discite parabolam. Cum iam ramus eius tener fuerit et folia nata scitis quia prope est aestas.  <b>Ita et uos cum uideritis haec omnia scitote quia prope est in ianuis</b>
24:34	Amen dico uobis quia non praeteribit <b>ista</b> <sup>1</sup> generatio donec omnia haec fiant.  <sup>1</sup> : ~ gener. ista, African <i>e</i>	Amen dico uobis quia non praeteribit <b>haec</b> generatio donec omnia haec fiant.
24:35 ✕	Caelum et terra transibunt, uerba uero mea non praeteribunt.	Caelum et terra transibunt, uerba uero mea non praeteribunt.
24:36	De die autem illa et hora nemo scit neque angeli caelorum nisi Pater solus.	De die autem illa et hora nemo scit neque angeli caelorum nisi Pater solus.
24:37-8	Sicut autem in diebus Noe ita erit et aduentus Filii hominis. <b>Quomodo</b> <sup>1</sup> enim erant in diebus ante diluuium comedentes et bibentes nubentes et nuptum tradentes.  <sup>1</sup> : African <i>e</i>	Sicut autem in diebus Noe ita erit et aduentus Filii hominis. { <b>Sicut</b> enim} erant in diebus ante diluuium comedentes et bibentes nubentes et nuptum tradentes.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c d fff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup>; om. enim, b; &gt;Nam]</i> sicut, <i>a ff<sup>1</sup></i>
24:40-1	Tunc duo erunt in agro, unus adsumetur et unus relinquetur, duae molentes in mola, una adsumetur et <b>alia</b> <sup>1</sup> relinquetur.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>f</i>	Tunc duo erunt in agro, unus adsumetur et unus relinquetur, duae molentes in mola, una adsumetur et <b>una</b> <sup>1</sup> relinquetur.  <sup>1</sup> : all except <i>f</i>
24:42	Uigilate ergo quia nescitis qua hora Dominus uester uenturus sit.	Uigilate ergo quia nescitis qua hora Dominus uester uenturus sit.
24:44-6	Estote parati <b>quia</b> { <b>nescitis qua</b> hora} Filius hominis uenturus est. Quis, putas, est fidelis seruus et prudens quem constituit dominus suus <b>super</b> familiam suam ut det illis cibum in tempore? Beatus ille seruus quem cum uenerit dominus eius inuenerit sic facientem.	Estote parati <b>quia</b> { <b>qua nescitis</b> hora} <sup>1</sup> Filius hominis uenturus est. Quis, putas, est fidelis seruus et prudens quem constituit dominus suus <b>supra</b> familiam suam ut det illis cibum in tempore? Beatus ille seruus quem cum uenerit dominus eius inuenerit sic facientem.
24:48-9	Si autem dixerit malus seruus ille in corde suo: moram facit dominus meus uenire, et coeperit percutere conseruos suos	Si autem dixerit malus seruus ille in corde suo: moram facit dominus meus uenire, et coeperit percutere conseruos suos.
24:50-1	Ueniet dominus serui illius in die qua non sperat et hora qua ignorat et diuidet eum partemque eius ponet cum hypocritis.	Ueniet dominus serui illius in die qua non sperat et hora qua ignorat et diuidet eum partemque eius ponet cum hypocritis.

25:1-2	Tunc {simile erit} regnum caelorum decem uirginibus quae accipientes lampades suas exierunt obuam sponso et sponsae; quinque autem ex eis erant fatuae et quinque prudentes.	Tunc {simile erit} regnum caelorum decem uirginibus quae accipientes lampadas suas exierunt obuam sponso et sponsae; quinque autem ex eis erant fatuae et quinque prudentes.
25:5	Moram autem faciente sponso dormitauerunt omnes et dormierunt.	Moram autem faciente sponso dormitauerunt omnes et dormierunt.
25:6	Media autem nocte clamor factus est: ecce sponsus uenit, exite obuam ei.	Media autem nocte clamor factus est: ecce sponsus uenit, exite obuam ei.
25:7	Tunc surrexerunt omnes uirgines illae et ornauerunt lampades suas.	Tunc surrexerunt omnes uirgines illae et ornauerunt lampades suas
25:8	Fatuae autem sapientibus dixerunt: date nobis de oleo uestro quia lampades nostrae extinguuntur.	Fatuae autem sapientibus dixerunt: date nobis de oleo uestro quia lampades nostrae extinguuntur
25:9	Responderunt prudentes <b>atque dixerunt</b> <sup>1</sup> : ne forte non sufficiat nobis et uobis.  Ite potius ad uendentes et emite uobis.  <sup>1</sup> : seemingly unique; >et dixerunt, ff <sup>1</sup> g <sup>1</sup>	Responderunt prudentes <b>dicentes</b> <sup>1</sup> : ne forte non sufficiat nobis et uobis.  Ite potius ad uendentes et emite uobis.  <sup>1</sup> : Jülicher
25:10	Dum autem irent emere uenit sponsus.  Et quae paratae erant intrauerunt cum eo ad nuptias, et clausa est ianua.	Dum autem irent emere uenit sponsus.  Et quae paratae erant intrauerunt cum eo ad nuptias, et clausa est ianua.
25:11	Nouissime ueniunt et reliquae uirgines dicentes: domine, domine, aperi nobis.	Nouissime ueniunt et reliquae uirgines dicentes: domine, domine aperi nobis.
25:12	At ille respondens ait: amen dico uobis: nescio uos.	At ille respondens ait: amen dico uobis: nescio uos.
25:13	Uigilate itaque quia nescitis diem neque horam.	Uigilate itaque quia nescitis diem neque horam.
25:14-5	Sicut enim homo proficiscens uocauit seruos suos et tradidit {illis bona sua} et uni dedit quinque talenta, alii duo, alii uero unum.	Sicut enim homo proficiscens uocauit seruos suos et tradidit {illis bona sua} et uni dedit quinque talenta, alii <b>autem</b> duo, alii uero unum.
25:16	Abiit autem qui quinque talenta acceperat et operatus est in eis; lucratus est alia quinque.	Abiit autem qui quinque talenta acceperat et operatus est in eis; <b>et</b> lucratus est alia quinque.
25:17	Qui duo acceperat; lucratus est alia duo.	Qui duo acceperat; lucratus est alia duo.
25:18	Qui autem unum acceperat, abiens fodit in <b>terram</b> et abscondit pecuniam domini sui.	Qui autem unum acceperat, abiens fodit in <b>terra</b> et abscondit pecuniam domini sui.

25:19	Post multum uero temporis uenit dominus seruorum illorum.	Post multum uero temporis uenit dominus seruorum illorum.
25:21	Ait illi dominus: <sup>1</sup> <b>euge serue bone</b> <sup>2</sup> et fidelis, quia super pauca fuisti fidelis super multa te constituam, intra in gaudium domini tui.  <sup>1</sup> : unique <i>om.</i> eius <sup>2</sup> : <i>c d f f f<sup>1</sup> f f<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q r<sup>1</sup></i>	Ait illi dominus <b>eius: euge bone serue</b> <sup>2</sup> et fidelis, quia super pauca fuisti fidelis super multa te constituam, intra in gaudium domini tui.  <sup>2</sup> : <i>a aur b h</i>
25:24-5	Accedens autem et qui unum talentum acceperat ait: domine scio quia homo durus es, metis ubi non seminasti et congregas ubi non sparsisti; et timens abii et abscondi talentum* tuum in terra; ecce habes quod tuum est.	Accedens autem et qui unum talentum acceperat ait: domine scio quia homo durus es, metis ubi non seminasti et congregas ubi non sparsisti; et timens abii et abscondi talentum* tuum in terra; ecce habes quod tuum est.
25:26-8	Respondens autem dominus eius dixit ei: serue male et piger, sciebas quia meto ubi non semino et congrego ubi non sparsi; oportuit ergo te mittere pecuniam meam nummulariis et ueniens ego {recepissem utique quod meum est cum <b>usuris</b> } <sup>1</sup> ; tollite itaque ab eo talentum et date ei qui habet decem talenta.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>g<sup>1</sup></i>	Respondens autem dominus eius dixit ei: serue male et piger, sciebas quia meto ubi non semino et congrego ubi non sparsi; oportuit ergo te mittere pecuniam meam nummulariis et ueniens ego {recepissem utique quod meum est cum <b>usura</b> } <sup>1</sup> ; tollite itaque ab eo talentum et date ei qui habet decem talenta.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>d l</i>
25:29 ✕	Omni enim habenti dabitur et abundabit, ei {autem qui non habet} et quod uidetur habere auferetur ab eo.	Omni enim habenti dabitur et abundabit, ei {autem qui non habet} et quod uidetur habere auferetur ab eo.
25:30	Et inutilem seruum eicite in tenebras exteriores; illic erit fletus et stridor dentium.	Et inutilem seruum eicite in tenebras exteriores; illic erit fletus et stridor dentium.
25:31-3	Cum autem uenerit Filius hominis in maiestate sua et omnes angeli cum eo, tunc sedebit super sedem maiestatis suae, et congregabuntur ante eum omnes gentes, et separabit eos ab inuicem sicut pastor segregat oves ab <b>haedis</b> et statu et oves quidem a dextris suis, <b>haedos</b> autem a sinistris.	Cum autem uenerit Filius hominis in maiestate sua et omnes angeli cum eo, tunc sedebit super sedem maiestatis suae, et congregabuntur ante eum omnes gentes, et separabit eos ab inuicem sicut pastor segregat oves ab <b>hedis</b> et statu et oves quidem a dextris suis, <b>hedos</b> autem a sinistris.
25:34	Uenite, benedicti Patris mei, possidete paratum uobis regnum a constitutione mundi.	Uenite, benedicti Patris mei, possidete paratum uobis regnum a constitutione mundi.
25:40	Amen dico uobis: quamdiu fecistis uni {de his fratribus meis minimis} <sup>1</sup> , mihi fecistis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur f; de&gt;ex, g<sup>1</sup>; &gt;ex, om. his, h l r<sup>1</sup></i>	Amen dico uobis: quamdiu fecistis uni {de his fratribus meis minimis}, mihi fecistis.
25:46	Et ibunt <b>hi</b> in supplicium aeternum*, iusti autem in uitam aeternam.	Et ibunt <b>hii</b> in supplicium aeternum*, iusti autem in uitam aeternam

26:1-2	Et factum est cum consummasset Iesus sermones hos omnes dixit discipulis suis: scitis quia post biduum pascha fiet, et Filius hominis tradetur ut crucifigatur.	Et factum est cum consummasset Iesus sermones hos omnes dixit discipulis suis: scitis quia post biduum pascha fiet, et Filius hominis tradetur ut crucifigatur.
26:3-4	Tunc congregati sunt principes sacerdotum et seniores populi in atrium principis sacerdotum qui dicebatur <b>Caiphas</b> ; et consilium fecerunt ut Iesum dolo tenerent et occiderent.	Tunc congregati sunt principes sacerdotum et seniores populi in atrium principis sacerdotum qui dicebatur <b>Caiaiphas</b> ; et consilium fecerunt ut Iesum dolo tenerent et occiderent.
26:6	{Cum autem esset Iesus} in Bethania in domo Simonis leprosi.	{Cum autem esset Iesus} in Bethania in domo Simonis leprosi.
26:7	Accessit ad eum mulier habens alabastrum unguenti pretiosi et effudit super caput ipsius recumbentis.	Accessit ad eum mulier habens alabastrum unguenti pretiosi et effudit super caput ipsius recumbentis.
26:8-9	Uidentes autem discipuli indignati sunt dicentes: ut quid perditio haec {} <sup>1</sup> ? Potuit enim istud uenundari multo et dari pauperibus.  <sup>1</sup> : om. {}, <i>aur c d f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q (r<sup>1</sup>)</i>	Uidentes autem discipuli indignati sunt dicentes: ut quid perditio haec? Potuit enim istud uenundari multo et dari pauperibus.
26:10-1	Sciens autem Iesus ait illis: quid molesti estis mulieri? Opus bonum operata est in me; nam semper pauperes habetis uobis cum, me autem non semper <b>habebitis</b> * <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b c f ff<sup>1</sup> q</i>	Sciens autem Iesus ait illis: quid molesti estis mulieri? Opus bonum operata est in me; nam semper pauperes habetis uobis cum, me autem non semper <b>habetis</b> * <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>d ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l r<sup>1</sup></i>
26:12	Mittens enim haec hoc unguentum in corpus meum, ad sepeliendum me fecit.	Mittens enim haec unguentum hoc in corpus meum, ad sepeliendum me fecit
26:13	Amen dico uobis: ubicumque praedicatum fuerit hoc euangelium in toto mundo, dicetur et quod haec fecit in memoriam eius.	Amen dico uobis: ubicumque praedicatum fuerit hoc euangelium in toto mundo, dicetur et quod haec fecit in memoriam eius.
26:15	Et ait illis: quid uultis mihi dare et ego uobis eum tradam? At illi constituerunt ei triginta argenteos.	Et ait illis: quid uultis mihi dare et ego uobis eum tradam? At illi constituerunt ei triginta argenteos.
26:17	Prima autem <b>azimorum</b> accesserunt discipuli ad Iesum dicentes: ubi uis <b>tibi paremus</b> comedere pascha?	Prima autem <b>azymorum</b> accesserunt discipuli ad Iesum dicentes: ubi uis <b>paremus tibi</b> comedere pascha?
26:18	{At Iesus dixit}: ite in ciuitatem ad quendam.	{At Iesus dixit}: ite in ciuitatem ad quendam.
26:19	Et fecerunt discipuli sicut constituit <b>eis</b> Iesus et parauerunt pascha.	Et fecerunt discipuli sicut constituit <b>illis</b> Iesus et parauerunt pascha.

26:20	{Uespere autem facto} discumbibat cum duodecim discipulis.	{Uespere autem facto} discumbibat cum duodecim discipulis.
26:21	Et edentibus illis dixit: amen dico uobis quia unus {uestrum me traditurus est}.	Et edentibus illis dixit: amen dico uobis quia unus {uestrum me traditurus est}.
26:22	Et contristati ualde coeperunt singuli dicere: numquid ego sum domine?	Et contristati ualde coeperunt singuli dicere: numquid ego sum Domine?
26:23	At ipse respondens ait: qui <b>intingit</b> mecum manum in parapside hic me tradet.	At ipse respondens ait: qui <b>intinguit</b> mecum manum in parapside hic me tradet.
26:24 ✕	Filius quidem hominis uadit sicut scriptum est de illo; uae autem homini illi per quem Filius hominis <b>tradetur</b> <sup>1</sup> .  Bonum erat <b>illi</b> {si natus non fuisset homo ille}.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup></i>	Filius quidem hominis uadit sicut scriptum est de illo; uae autem homini illi per quem Filius hominis <b>traditur</b> <sup>1</sup> .  Bonum erat <b>ei</b> {si natus non fuisset homo ille}.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b d f g<sup>1</sup></i>
26:25	Respondens autem Iudas qui tradidit eum dixit: numquid ego sum, rabbi? Ait illi: tu dixisti.	Respondens autem Iudas qui tradidit eum dixit: numquid ego sum, rabbi? Ait illi: tu dixisti.
26:26-7	Cenantibus autem eis accepit Iesus panem et benedixit ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis et ait: accipite et comedite, hoc est corpus meum. Et accipiens calicem gratias egit et dedit illis dicens	Cenantibus autem eis accepit Iesus panem et benedixit ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis et ait: accipite et comedite, hoc est corpus meum. Et accipiens calicem gratias egit et dedit illis dicens
26:29	Dico autem uobis: non bibam a modo de hoc genimine <sup>1</sup> uitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam uobis cum nouum in regno Patris mei.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>	Dico autem uobis: non bibam a modo de hoc genimine uitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam uobis cum nouum in regno Patris mei.
26:30	Et hymno dicto exierunt in montem Oliueti.	Et hymno dicto exierunt in montem Oliueti.
26:31	Tunc dicit illis Iesus: omnes uos scandalum patiemini in me in ista nocte.  Scriptum est enim: percutiam pastorem, et dispergentur oues gregis.	Tunc dicit illis Iesus: omnes uos scandalum patiemini in me in ista nocte.  Scriptum est enim: percutiam pastorem, et dispergentur oues gregis.
26:33	Respondens autem Petrus ait illi: et si omnes scandalizati fuerint, {} <sup>1</sup> ego numquam scandalizabor.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>unique om.</i>	Respondens autem Petrus ait illi: et si omnes scandalizati fuerint, <b>in te</b> ego numquam scandalizabor.
26:34	Ait illi Iesus: amen dico tibi quia in hac nocte {antequam gallus cantet} ter me negabis.	Ait illi Iesus: amen dico tibi quia in hac nocte {antequam gallus cantet} ter me negabis.
26:36	Tunc uenit Iesus cum illis in uillam <sup>1</sup> quae dicitur Gethsemani et dixit discipulis suis: sedete hic donec uadam illuc et orem.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>	Tunc uenit Iesus cum illis in uillam quae dicitur Gethsemani et dixit discipulis suis: sedete hic donec uadam illuc et orem.

26:37	Et adsumpto Petro et duobus filiis Zebedaei coepit contristari et maestus esse.	Et adsumpto Petro et duobus filiis Zebedaei coepit contristari et maestus esse.
26:38	Tunc ait illis: tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem; sustinete hic et uigilate me cum.	Tunc ait illis: tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem; sustinete hic et uigilate me cum.
26:39	Et progressus pusillum procidit in faciem suam <b>adorans</b> et dicens: mi Pater, {si possibile est}, transeat a me calix iste; uerumtamen non sicut ego uolo sed sicut tu.	Et progressus pusillum procidit in faciem suam <b>orans</b> et dicens: mi Pater, {si possibile est}, transeat a me calix iste; uerumtamen non sicut ego uolo sed sicut tu.
26:40	Et uenit ad discipulos et inuenit eos dormientes et dicit Petro: sic non potuistis una hora uigilare me cum?	Et uenit ad discipulos et inuenit eos dormientes et dicit Petro: sic non potuistis una hora uigilare me cum?
26:41	uigilate et orate ut non intretis in temptationem.  spiritus quidem promptus est, caro autem infirma.	uigilate et orate ut non intretis in temptationem.  spiritus quidem promptus est, caro autem infirma.
26:42	Iterum secundo abiit et orauit dicens: pater mi, si non potest {calix <b>iste</b> } transire nisi bibam illum, fiat uoluntas tua.	Iterum secundo abiit et orauit dicens: Pater mi, si non potest { <b>hic</b> calix} transire nisi bibam illum, fiat uoluntas tua.
26:43	{Et uenit iterum} et inuenit eos dormientes; erant enim oculi eorum grauati.	{Et uenit iterum} et inuenit eos dormientes; erant enim oculi eorum grauati.
26:45	Tunc uenit ad discipulos suos et dicit illis: dormite iam et requiescite; ecce adpropinquauit hora.	Tunc uenit ad discipulos suos et dicit illis: dormite iam et requiescite; ecce adpropinquauit hora.
26:46	Surgite eamus; ecce adpropinquauit qui me <b>traditurus est</b> . <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Surgite eamus; ecce adpropinquauit qui me <b>tradit</b> .
26:48	Qui autem tradidit eum dederat illis signum dicens: Quemcumque osculatus fuero ipse est, tenete eum.	Qui autem tradidit eum dedit illis signum dicens: Quemcumque osculatus fuero ipse est, tenete eum.
26:49	Et confestim accedens ad Iesum dixit: haue rabbi, et osculatus est eum.	Et confestim accedens ad Iesum dixit: haue rabbi, et osculatus est eum.
26:50	Dixitque illi Iesus: amice ad quod uenisti?	Dixitque illi Iesus: amice ad quod uenisti?
26:51	Et ecce unus ex his qui erant cum Iesu extendens manum exemit gladium suum et percutiens seruum principis sacerdotum amputauit auriculam eius.	Et ecce unus ex his qui erant cum Iesu extendens manum exemit gladium suum et percutiens seruum principis sacerdotum amputauit auriculam eius.
26:52	Tunc ait illi Iesus: conuerte gladium tuum in locum suum; omnes enim qui acceperint gladium gladio peribunt.	Tunc ait illi Iesus: conuerte gladium tuum in locum suum; omnes enim qui acceperint gladium gladio peribunt.
26:53-4	An putas quia non possum rogare Patrem meum, ut <b>exhibeat</b> <sup>1</sup> mihi modo plus quam duodecim legiones angelorum? Quomodo ergo implebuntur scripturae quia sic oportet fieri?  <sup>1</sup> : unique	An putas quia non possum rogare Patrem meum, et <b>exhibebit</b> <sup>1</sup> mihi modo* plus quam duodecim legiones angelorum? Quomodo ergo implebuntur scripturae quia sic oportet fieri?  <sup>1</sup> : a aur b c f ff <sup>1</sup> ff <sup>2</sup> h l n q

26:55	In illa hora dixit Iesus: Tamquam ad latronem existis cum gladiis et fustibus comprehendere me? Cotidie apud uos sedebam docens in templo, et non me tenuistis.	In illa hora dixit Iesus <b>turbis</b> : Tamquam ad latronem existis cum gladiis et fustibus comprehendere me? Cotidie apud vos sedebam docens in templo, et non me tenuistis.
26:56	Hoc autem totum factum est ut implerentur scripturae prophetarum.	Hoc autem totum factum est ut implerentur scripturae prophetarum.
26:57	At illi tenentes Iesum duxerunt ad <b>Caiphan</b> principem sacerdotum ubi scribae et seniores conuenerant.	At illi tenentes Iesum duxerunt ad <b>Caiaphan</b> principem sacerdotum ubi scribae et seniores conuenerant.
26:58	Petrus autem sequebatur eum a longe.  Et ingressus intro sedebat cum ministris ut uideret finem.	Petrus autem sequebatur eum a longe.  Et ingressus intro sedebat cum ministris ut uideret finem.
26:60-1	Nouissime autem uenerunt duo falsi testes et dixerunt: hic dixit: possum destruere templum Dei et post triduum <sup>1</sup> aedificare illud.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c fff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l r<sup>1</sup></i>	Nouissime autem uenerunt duo falsi testes et dixerunt: hic dixit: possum destruere templum Dei et post triduum aedificare illud.
26:62-3	<b>Exsurgens</b> <sup>1</sup> princeps sacerdotum ait* illi: Nihil respondens ad ea quae isti {aduersum te testificantur}? Iesus autem tacebat.  Et princeps sacerdotum ait** illi: adiuro te per Deum uiuum ut dicas nobis si tu es Christus Filius Dei.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>fh</i>	Et <b>surgens</b> <sup>1</sup> princeps sacerdotum ait* illi: Nihil respondes ad ea quae isti {aduersum te testificantur}? Iesus autem tacebat.  Et princeps sacerdotum ait** illi: adiuro te per Deum uiuum ut dicas nobis si tu es Christus Filius Dei.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur b c d ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q r<sup>1</sup></i>
26:64	Dicit illi Iesus: tu dixisti.	Dicit illi Iesus: tu dixisti.
26:65	Tunc princeps sacerdotum scidit uestimenta sua dicens: blasphemauit; quid adhuc egemus testibus?	Tunc princeps sacerdotum scidit uestimenta sua dicens: blasphemauit; quid adhuc egemus testibus?
26:67	Tunc expuerunt in faciem eius et {colaphis eum ceciderunt}.	Tunc expuerunt in faciem eius et {colaphis eum ceciderunt}.
26:67-8	{Alii autem palmas in faciem ei dederunt} dicentes: prophetiza nobis Christe, quis est qui te percussit?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>{}, aur c fff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l n q (r<sup>1</sup>)</i>	{Alii autem palmas in faciem ei dederunt} dicentes: prophetiza nobis Christe, quis est qui te percussit?
26:69	Petrus uero sedebat foris in atrio.	Petrus uero sedebat foris in atrio.
26:72	Et iterum negauit cum iuramento: quia non noui hominem.	Et iterum negauit cum iuramento: quia non noui hominem.
26:73	Uere et tu ex illis es, nam et loquella tua {manifestum te facit} <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>	Uere et tu ex illis es, nam et loquella tua {manifestum te facit}.
26:74	Tunc coepit detestari et iurare quia non nouisset hominem. Et continuo gallus cantauit.	Tunc coepit detestari et iurare quia non nouisset hominem. Et continuo gallus cantauit
26:75	Et egressus foras plorauit amare.	Et egressus foras plorauit amare.
27:1-2	{Mane autem facto} consilium inierunt omnes principes sacerdotum et seniores populi aduersus Iesum ut eum morti traderent; et uinctum adduxerunt et tradiderunt Pontio Pilato praesidi.	{Mane autem facto} consilium inierunt omnes principes sacerdotum et seniores populi aduersus Iesum ut eum morti traderent; et uinctum adduxerunt eum et tradiderunt Pontio Pilato praesidi.

27:3-4	Tunc uidens Iudas qui eum tradidit quod damnatus esset; paenitentia ductus <b>retulit</b> triginta argenteos principibus sacerdotum et senioribus dicens: peccavi tradens sanguinem iustum.	Tunc uidens Iudas qui eum tradidit quod damnatus esset; paenitentia ductus <b>rettulit</b> triginta argenteos principibus sacerdotum et senioribus dicens: peccavi tradens sanguinem iustum.
27:4-5	At illi dixerunt: quid ad nos? Tu uideris. Et proiectis argenteis in templo recessit et abiens laqueo se suspendit.	At illi dixerunt: quid ad nos? Tu uideris. Et proiectis argenteis in templo recessit et abiens laqueo se suspendit.
27:6	Principes autem sacerdotum acceptis argenteis dixerunt: non licet mittere eos in corbanam quia pretium sanguinis est.	Principes autem sacerdotum acceptis argenteis dixerunt: non licet mittere eos in corbanam quia pretium sanguinis est.
27:7	Consilio autem inito emerunt {ex illis} agrum figuli in sepulturam peregrinorum.  <sup>1</sup> : {}, <i>aur</i> (eis, c) <i>fff</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>g</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>l</i>	Consilio autem inito emerunt ex illis agrum figuli in sepulturam peregrinorum.
27:9-10	Tunc impletum est quod dictum est per Hieremiam prophetam dicentem: et acceperunt triginta argenteos pretium adpretiati quem adpretiauerunt a filiis Israhel. Et dederunt eos in agrum figuli {sicut constituit mihi Dominus}.	Tunc impletum est quod dictum est per Hieremiam prophetam dicentem: et acceperunt triginta argenteos pretium adpretiati quem adpretiauerunt a filiis Israhel. Et dederunt eos in agrum figuli {sicut constituit mihi Dominus}.
27:11	Iesus autem stetit ante praesidem. Et interrogauit eum praeses dicens: tu es rex Iudaeorum?  Dicit ei Iesus: tu dicis.	Iesus autem stetit ante praesidem. Et interrogauit eum praeses dicens: tu es rex Iudaeorum  Dicit ei Iesus: tu dicis.
27:13	Tunc dicit illi Pilatus: non audis quanta aduersum te dicant testimonia?	Tunc dicit illi Pilatus: non audis quanta aduersum te dicant testimonia
27:16	Habebat autem tunc uinctum insignem qui dicebatur Barabbas.	Habebat autem tunc uinctum insignem qui dicebatur Barabbas
27:19	Sedente autem illo pro tribunali misit ad <b>eum</b> uxor eius dicens: nihil tibi et iusto illi; multa enim passa sum hodie per uisum propter eum.	Sedente autem illo pro tribunali misit ad <b>illum</b> uxor eius dicens: nihil tibi et iusto illi; multa enim passa sum hodie per uisum propter eum.
27:22-3	Dicit illis Pilatus: quid igitur faciam de Iesu qui dicitur Christus? Dicunt omnes: crucifigatur. Ait illis praeses: quid enim mali fecit? At illi magis clamabant dicentes: crucifigatur.	Dicit illis Pilatus: quid igitur faciam de Iesu qui dicitur Christus? Dicunt omnes: crucifigatur. Ait illis praeses: quid enim mali fecit? At illi magis clamabant dicentes: crucifigatur
27:24	Uidens autem Pilatus quia nihil proficeret sed magis tumultus fieret, accepta aqua lauit manus coram populo dicens: innocens ego sum a sanguine iusti <sup>1</sup> huius; uos uideritis. <b>(Ep. 74.4)</b>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c fff</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>g</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>l</i>	Uidens autem Pilatus quia nihil proficeret sed magis tumultus fieret accepta aqua lauit manus coram populo dicens innocens ego sum a sanguine iusti huius; uos uideritis
27:25	Et respondens {uniuersus populus} dixit: sanguis eius super nos et super filios nostros.	Et respondens uniuersus populus dixit: sanguis eius super nos et super filios nostros.
27:26	Tunc dimisit illis Barabban; Iesum autem flagellatum tradidit {eis ut crucifigeretur}.	Tunc dimisit illis Barabban Iesum autem flagellatum tradidit {eis ut crucifigeretur}.



27:27-9	<p>Tunc milites praesidis suscipientes Iesum in praetorio congregauerunt ad eum uniuersam cohortem et exuentes eum {}<sup>1</sup>, <b>clamidem</b> coccineam circumdederunt ei et plectentes coronam de spinis posuerunt super caput eius et harundinem in dextera <b>illius</b><sup>2</sup> et genu flexo<sup>3</sup> ante eum inludebant dicentes: haue rex Iudaeorum.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: om. {}, <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>  <sup>2</sup>: unique  <sup>3</sup>: <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i>; flexo&gt;posito, <i>h r<sup>1</sup></i></p>	<p>Tunc milites praesidis suscipientes Iesum in praetorio congregauerunt ad eum uniuersam cohortem et exuentes eum, <b>clamydem</b> coccineam circumdederunt ei et plectentes coronam de spinis posuerunt super caput eius et harundinem in dextera <b>eius</b> et genu flexo ante eum inludebant dicentes: haue rex Iudaeorum.</p>
27:30	Et expuentes in eum acceperunt harundinem et percutiebant caput eius.	Et expuentes in eum acceperunt harundinem et percutiebant caput eius
27:31	<p>Et postquam inluserunt ei exuerunt eum <b>clamide</b><sup>1</sup> et induerunt eum uestimentis <b>suis</b><sup>2</sup> et duxerunt *<sup>3</sup> ut crucifigerent.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>r<sup>1</sup></i>  <sup>2</sup>: unique; sua, <i>d h</i>  <sup>3</sup>: unique</p>	<p>Et postquam inluserunt ei exuerunt eum <b>clamydem</b> et induerunt eum uestimentis <b>eius</b> et duxerunt {eum ut crucifigerent}<sup>4</sup>.</p> <p><sup>4</sup>: <i>aur d f ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q r<sup>1</sup></i></p>
27:32	Exeuntes autem inuenerunt hominem Cyreneum nomine Simonem; hunc angariauerunt ut tolleret crucem eius.	Exeuntes autem inuenerunt hominem Cyreneum nomine Simonem hunc angariauerunt ut tolleret crucem eius.
27:33	Et uenerunt in locum qui dicitur Golgotha quod est Calvariae locus.	Et uenerunt in locum qui dicitur Golgotha quod est Calvariae locus.
27:34	Et dederunt ei uinum bibere cum felle mixtum, et cum gustasset noluit bibere.	Et dederunt ei uinum bibere cum felle mixtum, et cum gustasset noluit bibere.
27:35	Postquam autem crucifixerunt eum, diuiserunt uestimenta eius sortem mittentes.	Postquam autem crucifixerunt eum, diuiserunt uestimenta eius sortem mittentes.
27:36	Et sedentes seruabant eum.	Et sedentes seruabant eum.
27:37	Et inposuerunt super caput eius causam ipsius scriptam: hic est Iesus rex Iudaeorum.	Et inposuerunt super caput eius causam ipsius scriptam: hic est Iesus rex Iudaeorum.
27:38	Tunc crucifixi sunt cum eo duo latrones, unus a* dextris et unus a** sinistris.	Tunc crucifixi sunt cum eo duo latrones, unus a dextris et unus a sinistris.
27:39	<p>Praetereuntes<sup>1</sup> autem blasphemabant eum mouentes capita sua.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>aur ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l</i></p>	Praetereuntes autem blasphemabant eum mouentes capita sua.
27:42	<p>Alios saluos fecit, se ipsum non potest saluum facere.</p> <p>Descendat nunc de cruce, et <b>credimus</b> ei.</p>	<p>Alios saluos fecit se ipsum non potest saluum facere.</p> <p>Descendat nunc de cruce, et <b>credemus</b> ei.</p>
27:44	Id ipsum autem et latrones qui fixi erant cum eo inproperabant ei.	Id ipsum autem et latrones qui fixi erant cum eo inproperabant ei.
27:45	A sexta autem hora tenebrae factae sunt super uniuersam terram usque ad horam nonam.	A sexta autem hora tenebrae factae sunt super uniuersam terram usque ad horam nonam.

27:46 <sup>18</sup>	Et circa horam nonam clamauit Iesus uoce magna dicens: heli heli lema sabacthani, hoc est: Deus meus, Deus meus, <b>quare<sup>1</sup> me dereliquisti?</b>  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Et circa horam nonam clamauit Iesus uoce magna dicens: Heli Heli lema sabacthani, hoc est: Deus meus, Deus meus, <b>ut quid dereliquisti me?</b>
27:47	Quidam autem illic stantes et audientes dicebant: Heliam uocat iste.	Quidam autem illic stantes et audientes dicebant: Heliam uocat iste.
27:48	Et continuo currens unus ex eis acceptam spongiam impleuit aceto et imposuit harundini et dabat ei bibere.	Et continuo currens unus ex eis acceptam spongiam impleuit aceto et imposuit harundini et dabat ei bibere.
27:50	Iesus autem iterum clamans uoce magna emisit spiritum.	Iesus autem iterum clamans uoce magna emisit spiritum.
27:51	Et uelum templi scissum est in duas partes a summo usque deorsum.	Et <b>ecce</b> uelum templi scissum est in duas partes a summo usque deorsum.
27:51-2	Terra mota est, et petrae scissae <sup>1</sup> sunt, et monumenta aperta sunt.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c f g<sup>1</sup> h l</i>	Terra mota est, et petrae scissae sunt, et monumenta aperta sunt
27:52-3	Et multa corpora sanctorum qui dormierunt surrexerunt et exeuntes de monumentis post resurrectionem eius uenerunt in sanctam ciuitatem et apparuerunt multis.	Multa corpora sanctorum qui dormierant surrexerunt et exeuntes de monumentis post resurrectionem eius uenerunt in sanctam ciuitatem et apparuerunt multis
27:54	Centurio autem et qui cum eo erant custodientes Iesum uiso terrae motu et his quae fiebant timuerunt ualde dicentes: uere Dei Filius erat iste.	Centurio autem et qui cum eo erant custodientes Iesum uiso terrae motu et his quae fiebant timuerunt ualde dicentes; uere Dei Filius erat iste.
27:55	Erant autem ibi mulieres multae a longe quae secutae <b>fuerant</b> Iesum a Galilea ministrantes ei.	Erant autem ibi mulieres multae a longe quae secutae <b>erant</b> Iesum a Galilaea ministrantes ei.
27:57	{Cum sero factum} esset uenit homo quidam diues ab Arimathia nomine Ioseph qui et ipse discipulus erat Iesu.	{Cum sero autem factum} esset uenit quidam homo diues ab Arimathia nomine Ioseph qui et ipse discipulus erat Iesu.
27:59	{Et accepto corpore <b>Iesu</b> } <sup>1</sup> inuoluit illud in sindone munda.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b</i>	{Et accepto corpore <b>Ioseph</b> } <sup>1</sup> inuoluit illud sindone munda.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>
27:60	Et posuit illud in monumento suo nouo quod exciderat in petra et aduoluit saxum magnum ad ostium monumenti et abiit.	Et posuit illud in monumento suo nouo quod exciderat in petra et aduoluit saxum magnum ad ostium monumenti et abiit.
27:61	Erat autem ibi Maria Magdalene et altera Maria sedentes contra sepulchrum.	Erat autem ibi Maria Magdalene et altera Maria sedentes contra sepulchrum.
27:64	Iube ergo <b>custodire<sup>1</sup></b> sepulchrum usque in diem tertium ne forte ueniant discipuli eius et furentur eum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>	Iube ergo <b>custodiri<sup>1</sup></b> sepulchrum usque in diem tertium ne forte ueniant discipuli eius et furentur eum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b c f ff<sup>2</sup> h n</i>

<sup>18</sup> *Psalm* 21v(22):2. Comment which follows ‘He has used the beginning of the twenty-first Psalm’. Vulgate *Psalm* 22:2: “*Deus Deus meus quare dereliquisti me?*” Jerome’s version in *CM* is closer to the Vulgate Psalm, perhaps indicative of their common Hieronymian authorship. See discussion in chapter above.

28:1	{Uespere autem sabbati quae lucescit} in <b>prima</b> sabbati uenit Maria <b>Magdalenae</b> et altera maria uidere sepulchrum.	Uespere autem sabbati quae lucescit in <b>primam</b> sabbati uenit Maria <b>Magdalene</b> et altera Maria uidere sepulchrum.
28:2-3	Et ecce terrae motus factus est magnus; angelus enim Domini descendit de caelo et* accedens reuoluit lapidem et sedebat super eum; erat autem aspectus eius sicut <b>fulgor</b> , et uestimentum eius sicut nix.	Et ecce terrae motus factus est magnus; angelus enim Domini descendit de caelo et* accedens reuoluit lapidem et sedebat super eum; erat autem aspectus eius sicut <b>fulgur</b> ; et uestimentum eius sicut nix.
28:4-5	Prae timore autem eius exterriti sunt custodes et facti sunt uelut mortui; respondens que angelus dixit mulieribus: nolite timere uos; scio enim quod Iesum qui crucifixus est quaeritis.	Prae timore autem eius exterriti sunt custodes et facti sunt uelut mortui; respondens autem angelus dixit mulieribus: nolite timere uos; scio enim quod Iesum qui crucifixus est quaeritis.
28:6-7	Uenite <b>et</b> uidete ubi positus erat  et praecedit uos in Galileam	Uenite uidete locum ubi positus erat (Dominus)  et <b>ecce</b> praecedit uos in Galilaeam.
28:8	Et exierunt cito de monumento cum timore et <b>gaudio magno</b> currentes nuntiare discipulis eius.	Et exierunt cito de monumento cum timore et <b>magno gaudio</b> <sup>1</sup> currentes nuntiare discipulis eius.  <sup>1</sup> : listed in Jülicher as uniquely Vulgate
28:9	Et ecce Iesus occurrit illis dicens: auete.  Illae autem accesserunt et tenuerunt pedes eius et adorauerunt eum.	Et ecce Iesus occurrit illis dicens: hauete.  Illae autem accesserunt et tenuerunt pedes eius et adorauerunt eum
28:10	Tunc ait illis Iesus: nolite timere.  Ite nuntiate fratribus meis ut eant in galileam, ibi me uidebunt.	Tunc ait illis Iesus nolite timere.  Ite nuntiate fratribus meis ut eant in Galilaeam, ibi me uidebunt.
28:12-4	Et congregati cum senioribus consilio accepto pecuniam copiosam dederunt militibus dicentes: Dicite quia discipuli eius {nocte uenerunt et} furati sunt eum nobis dormientibus, et si hoc auditum fuerit a praeside, nos suadebimus ei et securos uos faciemus.	Et congregati cum senioribus consilio accepto pecuniam copiosam dederunt militibus dicentes: Dicite quia discipuli eius {nocte uenerunt et} furati sunt eum nobis dormientibus, et si hoc auditum fuerit a praeside, nos suadebimus ei et securos uos faciemus
28:16	Undecim autem discipuli abierunt in Galileam in montem ubi constituerat illis Iesus.	Undecim autem discipuli abierunt in Galilaeam in montem ubi constituerat illis Iesus.
28:18	Accedens Iesus locutus est eis dicens: data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo et in terra.	Accedens Iesus locutus est eis dicens data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo et in terra.
28:19	Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.	Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.

28:20	<p>Docentes eos seruare omnia quaecumque mandaui uobis.</p> <p>Et ecce ego uobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi.</p>	<p>Docentes eos seruare omnia quaecumque mandaui uobis</p> <p>Et ecce ego uobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi.</p>
-------	---	--

**Table 2: Jerome's latest text of *Matthew: Commentary on Jeremiah***

The following chart details the citations annotated with an asterisk by S. Reiter in his *CSEL 59, S. Eusebii Hieronymi, In Hieremiam Prophetam Libri Sex*, (1913). Note on asterisks to be found on p. 441, 'Loci asterisco notati cum Vulgata non concordant.'

<i>Matthew</i>	<i>in Hieremiam Prophetam</i>	<i>Vulgate</i>
2:17-18	Tunc <b>impletum</b> <sup>1</sup> est, quod dictum est per Hieremiam prophetam dicentem: uox in Rama audita est, ploratus et ululatus multus Rachel <b>flentis</b> <sup>2</sup> filios suos et noluit consolari, quia non sunt. [6.18]  <sup>1,2</sup> : unique	Tunc <b>adimpletum</b> est, quod dictum est per Hieremiam prophetam dicentem: uox in Rama audita est, ploratus et ululatus multus, Rachel <b>plorans</b> filios suos et noluit consolari, quia non sunt.
3:9	Potest Deus de lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abraham. [6.1]	Potest Deus de lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abrahae.
3:10	Iam securis ad <b>radices</b> <sup>1</sup> arborum posita est. [4.60]  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a b c d f g<sup>1</sup> q</i>	Iam <b>enim</b> securis ad <b>radicem</b> arborum posita est.
4:19 (Mk. 1:17)	Uenite post me et faciam uos piscatores hominum. [3.65]	Uenite post me et faciam uos <b>feri</b> piscatores hominum.
5:5	Beati <b>lugentes</b> <sup>1</sup> , quoniam ipsi consolabuntur. [6.17]  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Beati <b>qui lugent</b> <sup>1</sup> quoniam ipsi consolabuntur.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a b c ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l, (-unt) aur d f h q</i>
5:14	Non potest abscondi ciuitas, <b>quae in monte sita est</b> [6.9]	Non potest ciuitas abscondi, <b>supra montem posita</b> .
5:14 bis	Non potest ciuitas abscondi in monte posita. [6.51]	Non potest ciuitas abscondi supra montem posita.
5:48	Estote perfecti, sicut Pater uester perfectus est. [2.99]	Estote <b>ergo uos</b> perfecti, sicut et Pater uester <b>caelestis</b> perfectus est.
7:6	<b>Ne</b> miseritis margaritas uestras ante porcos, et ne <b>detis</b> sanctum canibus. [1:70]	<b>Nolite dare</b> sanctum canibus, <b>neque</b> mittatis margaritas uestras ante porcos.
7:7	Petite, et <b>accipietis</b> <sup>1</sup> ; quaerite, et inuenietis; pulsate, et aperietur uobis. [5.65]  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Petite, et <b>dabitur uobis</b> <sup>1</sup> , quaerite et inuenietis; pulsate, et aperietur uobis.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur b c f ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l</i>

7:13	<p><b>Quam</b><sup>1</sup> lata {}<sup>2</sup> et spatiosa uia, quae ducit ad <b>mortem</b><sup>3</sup>. [2.81]</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>a b h l q</i> Jülicher  <sup>2</sup>: {} <i>om. porta, a b c h</i>  <sup>3</sup>: unique</p>	<p><b>Quia</b><sup>1</sup> lata <b>porta</b><sup>2</sup> et spatiosa uia, quae ducit ad <b>perditionem</b><sup>3</sup>.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>aur c fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup></i>  <sup>2</sup>: <i>aur fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i>  <sup>3</sup>: <i>a aur b c fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i></p>
10:23	<p>Cum <b>uos {persecuti fuerint}</b><sup>1</sup> in <b>hac</b> ciuitate<sup>2</sup>, fugite <b>ad</b><sup>3</sup> aliam. [5.44]</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>d</i>  <sup>2</sup>: ~ ciuitate hac, <i>d</i>  <sup>3</sup>: unique</p>	<p>Cum <b>autem persequentur uos</b><sup>1</sup> in ciuitate <b>ista</b>, fugite <b>in</b> aliam.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>a aur b c fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i></p>
10:28	<p>Qui potest et animam et corpus <b>occidere</b><sup>1</sup> in gehenna. [6.30]</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>k</i> (African)</p>	<p>Qui potest et animam et corpus <b>perdere</b><sup>1</sup> in gehennam.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>a aur b c d fff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q</i></p>
10:36	<p>Et inimici eius domestici eius. [2.72]</p>	<p>Et inimici <b>hominis</b> domestici eius</p>
11:27	<p>Nemo enim <b>cognoscit</b><sup>1</sup> Filium, nisi Pater et <b>nemo cognoscit</b><sup>2</sup> Patrem nisi filius et, cui uoluerit Filius reuelare. [3.3]</p> <p><sup>1</sup>: <i>d fff<sup>1</sup></i>  <sup>2</sup>: (nemo&gt;aliquis) cognoscit, <i>d</i></p>	<p>Et nemo <b>nouit</b> Filium nisi Pater <b>neque</b> Patrem <b>quis nouit</b> nisi Filius et, cui uoluerit Filius reuelare.</p>
12:37	<p>Ex <b>ore tuo</b> iustificaberis et ex <b>ore tuo</b> condemnaberis. [4.62]</p> <p>See. Aug. <i>de Trin.</i> 9.9.14</p>	<p>Ex <b>uerbis enim tuis</b> iustificaberis et ex <b>uerbis tuis</b> condemnaberis.</p>
13:12/25:29	<p>Qui enim habet, dabitur ei; qui autem non habet, <b>etiam id</b>, quod <b>habere uidetur</b>, auferetur ab eo. [1.62]</p>	<p>Qui enim habet, dabitur ei; et <b>abundabit</b>, qui autem non habet, et quod <b>habet</b> auferetur ab eo.</p> <p>25:29- Omni enim habenti dabitur, et abundabit ei autem qui non habet et quod <b>uidetur habere</b>, auferetur ab eo.</p>
13:43	<p>(quando) iusti fulgebunt <b>quasi</b> sol [6.19]</p>	<p>Tunc iusti fulgebunt <b>sicut</b> sol</p>
15:13	<p>Omnis enim plantatio, quam non plantauit <b>caelestis Pater</b>, eradicabitur. [1.6]</p>	<p>Omnis plantatio, quam non plantauit <b>Pater meus caelestis</b>, eradicabitur.</p>
15:19	<p>Et de corde <b>nostro</b> exeunt <b>pessimae</b> cogitationes. [2.77]</p>	<p>De corde enim exeunt cogitationes <b>malae</b>.</p>
15:24	<p>Non <b>ueni</b> nisi ad oues <b>perditas</b> domus Israhel. [6.26]</p>	<p>Non <b>sum missus</b> nisi ad oues quae <b>perierunt</b> domus Israhel.</p>

17:16	Usquequo <sup>1</sup> <b>sustinebo</b> <sup>2</sup> uos? [2.70]  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur</i> <sup>2</sup> : unique	Usquequo <b>patiar</b> uos?
18:7	<b>Oportet</b> <sup>1</sup> enim <b>uenire</b> <sup>2</sup> scandala, <b>uerum</b> <sup>3</sup> uae ei <sup>4</sup> , per quem <b>ueniunt</b> <sup>5</sup> <b>scandala</b> <sup>6</sup> . [1.15] <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : <i>a b c d ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> n q r<sup>1</sup></i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>om.</i> tamen, unique <sup>4</sup> : ei, unique. <i>om.</i> homini, unique <sup>5</sup> : unique <sup>6</sup> : ~ & > <b>scandala</b> , unique	<b>Necesse est</b> enim <b>ut ueniat</b> <sup>2</sup> scandala, <b>uerumtamen</b> <sup>3</sup> uae <b>homini</b> <sup>4</sup> , per quem <b>scandalum</b> <b>uenit</b> <sup>5</sup> .  <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur fl</i> <sup>3</sup> : all <sup>4</sup> : <i>aur d g<sup>1</sup></i> <sup>5</sup> : <i>a aur b c d ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q r<sup>1</sup></i>
19:24	Facilius camelus <b>intra</b> b <sup>1</sup> it per foramen acus quam diues in <b>regna (CM)</b> caelorum. [6.28]	Facilius est camelum per foramen acus transire, quam diuitem intrare in <b>regnum</b> caelorum.
21:13	Scriptum est: Domus <b>Patris mei</b> Domus orationis uocabitur; uos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronum. [2.34]	Scriptum est: Domus <b>mea</b> Domus orationis uocabitur; uos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronum.
24:35	Caelum et terra <b>pertransibunt</b> . [6.27]	Caelum et terra <b>transibunt</b>
24:35 bis	Caelum et terra <b>pertransibunt</b> eo. [6.40]	
25:29	See 13:12 above	
26:24	Melius ei <b>fuerat</b> , si natus non esset. [4.28]	<b>Bonum erat</b> ei, si natus non <b>fuisset</b> homo ille.

**Table 3: Jerome's Text of Mark: *Homilies on Mark***

1:1-3	Initium euangelii Iesu Xpisti filii Dei. Sicut scriptum est in Esaia propheta: Uox clamantis in deserto, Parate uiam Domini, rectas facite semitas eius.	Initium euangelii Iesu Christi Filii Dei. sicut scriptum est in Esaia propheta: ... Uox clamantis in deserto: parate viam Domini rectas facite semitas eius
1:2	Sicut scriptum est in Esaia propheta: Ecce mitto angelum meum ante faciem tuam, qui praeparabit uiam tuam.	Sicut scriptum est in Esaia propheta: ecce mitto angelum meum ante faciem tuam, qui praeparabit uiam tuam
1:4	Fuit Iohannes in deserto baptizans et praedicans	Fuit Iohannes in deserto baptizans et praedicans

1:5	Et egrediebatur ad illum <b>omnis</b> Iudaea {}  {}: Unique omission	Et egrediebatur ad illum <b>omnis</b> Iudaeae <b>regio</b>
1:5	Et baptizabantur ab illo in Iordane flumine, confitents peccata sua	Et baptizabantur ab illo in Iordane flumine, confitentes peccata sua
1:6	Et erat Iohannes uestitus <b>de</b> <sup>1</sup> pilis <b>camelorum</b> <sup>2</sup> et zona pellicia {}, et <b>cibus eius locustae</b> <sup>3</sup> et mel siluestre. <sup>4</sup>  {}: missing phrase included just below in homily <sup>1</sup> : <i>r</i> <sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> : unique pluralization <sup>3</sup> : unique <sup>4</sup> : unique. Only example to leave out verb.	Et erat Iohannes uestitus pilis <b>cameli</b> <sup>1</sup> et zona pellicia { <b>circa lumbos eius</b> } et <b>lucustas</b> et mel siluestre <b>edebat</b> . <sup>3</sup>  <sup>2</sup> : <i>cet.</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>cet.</i> <sup>4</sup> : <i>b f l q t</i>
1:6	Et lucustas et mel siluestre <b>comedebat</b> <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Et lucustas et mel silvestre <b>edebat</b>
1:7	Uenit fortior me post me, cuius non sum dignus procumbens soluere corrigiam calciamentorum eius	Uenit fortior me post me, cuius non sum dignus procumbens soluere corrigiam calciamentorum eius
1:8	Ego <b>baptizo</b> <sup>1</sup> uos aqua.  <sup>1</sup> : all <i>VL ex-aur</i>	Ego <b>baptizaui</b> <sup>1</sup> uos aqua.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur Vulgate</i>
1:9	{Et factum est} in diebus illis uenit Iesus a Nazareth Galilaeae	{Et factum est} in diebus illis uenit Iesus a Nazareth Galilaeae
1:9	Et baptizatus est in Iordane a Iohanne	Et baptizatus est in Iordane ab Iohanne
1:10	Et statim <sup>1</sup> ascendens de aqua uidit apertos caelos  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c f l</i>	Et statim ascendens de aqua uidit apertos caelos
1:10- 11	Et Spiritum tamquam columbam descendentem {} et manentem in ipso. Et uox facta est de <b>caelo</b> <sup>1</sup> : Tu es Filius meus <b>dilectissimus</b> <sup>2</sup> , in <b>quo</b> <sup>3</sup> conplacui.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b c</i> <sup>2</sup> : unique <sup>3</sup> : <i>aur b; &gt;in quem, d</i>	Et Spiritum tamquam columbam descendentem et manentem in ipso. Et uox facta est de <b>caelis</b> <sup>1</sup> : Tu es Filius meus <b>dilectus</b> <sup>2</sup> in <b>te</b> <sup>3</sup> conplacui.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur d f f f<sup>2</sup> l t</i> <sup>2</sup> : all <i>ex- c f f<sup>2</sup></i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>a c f f<sup>2</sup> l t</i>
1:12	Et {} Spiritus <b>expulit</b> eum in desertum ( <i>ueron</i> )	Et <b>statim</b> Spiritus <b>expellit</b> eum in desertum



	<sup>1</sup> : {} unique omission	
1:13	Eratque cum bestiis, et angeli ministrabant illi	Eratque cum bestiis et angeli ministrabant illi
1:14	Postquam autem traditus est Iohannes, uenit Iesus in Galilaeam	Postquam autem traditus est Iohannes uenit Iesus in Galilaeam
1:14	Praedicans euangelium regni Dei	Praedicans euangelium regni Dei
1:14-15	Praedicans euangelium regni Dei, et dicens: quoniam <b>adimpletum</b> <sup>1</sup> est <b>legis</b> <sup>2</sup> tempus, (uenit principium euangelii), adpropinquauit regnum Dei.  <sup>1</sup> : unique; > <b>adimpleta</b> , <i>c ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> : unique	Praedicans euangelium regni Dei, et dicens quoniam <b>impletum</b> est tempus et adpropinquauit regnum Dei
1:15	Paenitemini, et credite euangelio	Paenitemini et credite euangelio
1:16	Et praeteriens secus mare Galilaeae, uidit Simonem et Andream fratrem eius mittentes retia in mare: erant enim piscatores	Et praeteriens secus mare Galilaeae, uidit Simonem et Andream fratrem eius mittentes retia in mare: erant enim piscatores
1:17	Et dixit eis Iesus: Uenite post me, et faciam uos piscatores hominum.	Et dixit eis Iesus: Uenite post me, et faciam uos <b>fieri</b> piscatores hominum
1:18	Et protinus relictis retibus <sup>1</sup> secuti sunt eum  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur t</i>	Et protinus relictis retibus secuti sunt eum
1:19	Et progressus inde <sup>1</sup> pusillum, uidit Iacobum Zebedaei et Iohannem fratrem eius, et ipsos in naui componentes retia.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c fl</i>	Et progressus inde pusillum, uidit Iacobum Zebedaei et Iohannem fratrem eius, et ipsos in naui componentes retia.
1:20	Et statim uocauit illos: et relicto patre suo Zebedaeo in naui cum mercenariis, secuti sunt eum	Et statim uocauit illos: et relicto patre suo Zebedaeo in naui cum mercennariis, secuti sunt eum.
1:21	Et ingrediuntur Capharnaum, et statim sabbatis ingressus synagogam docebat eos	Et ingrediuntur Capharnaum et statim sabbatis ingressus synagogam docebat eos
1:22	Erat {} docens eos quasi potestatem habens, et non sicut scribae  { }: <i>om. enim, unique</i>	Erat enim docens eos quasi potestatem habens et non sicut scribae
1:22	Stupebant super doctrina eius	Et stupebant super doctrina eius
1:23-24	Et erat in synagoga eorum <sup>1</sup> homo {in spiritu immundo}, et exclamauit dicens: quid nobis et tibi?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>fl q</i>	Et erat in synagoga eorum homo {in spiritu immundo} et exclamauit dicens: quid nobis et tibi?
1:23-24	Et exclamauit dicens: Quid nobis et tibi, Iesu Nazarene?] Uenisti perdere nos? Scio <sup>1</sup> qui sis, sanctus Dei.	Et exclamauit dicens: Quid nobis et tibi, Iesu Nazarene?] Uenisti perdere nos? Scio qui sis, Sanctus Dei.

	<sup>1</sup> : +te, b f ff <sup>2</sup> q	
1:24	Quid nobis et tibi, Iesu Nazarene?	Quid nobis et tibi Iesu Nazarene?
1:25	Et comminatus est ei Iesus, dicens: obmutesce, et exi <b>ab</b> <sup>1</sup> homine.  <sup>1</sup> : c f	Et comminatus est ei Iesus, dicens: obmutesce, et exi <b>de</b> <sup>1</sup> homine.  <sup>1</sup> : aur b d ff <sup>2</sup> l q r <sup>1</sup>
1:26	Et discerpens <b>illum</b> <sup>1</sup> spiritus inmundus.  <sup>1</sup> : q	Et discerpens <b>eum</b> <sup>1</sup> spiritus inmundus.  <sup>1</sup> : aur b c d f ff <sup>2</sup> l r <sup>1</sup>
1:26	Et exclamans <sup>1</sup> uoce magna, exiuit ab eo.  <sup>1</sup> : aur f ff <sup>2</sup> l	Et exclamans uoce magna, exiuit ab eo.
1:27	Et mirati <sup>1</sup> sunt omnes, ita ut conquirent <sup>2</sup> inter se <sup>3</sup> (et cetera).  <sup>1</sup> : aur c f ff <sup>2</sup> l <sup>2</sup> : aur f l <sup>3</sup> : aur c d f l r <sup>1</sup>	Et mirati sunt omnes, ita ut conquirent inter se.
1:27	Mirati sunt omnes, ita ut inter se conquirent dicentes:] {Quidnam est hoc?} quae doctrina haec <sup>1</sup> noua <sup>2</sup> ?  { } : aur f l <sup>1</sup> : aur f r <sup>1</sup> l, ~haec doctrina, c ff <sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> : aur d f l q	Mirati sunt omnes ita ut conquirent inter se dicentes:] Quidnam est hoc? Quae doctrina haec noua?
1:27	Quia in potestate spiritibus inmundis imperat.	Quia in potestate et spiritibus inmundis imperat.
1:28	Et processit <sup>1</sup> {statim rumor eius <sup>2</sup> } <sup>3</sup> in omnem regionem Galilaeae  <sup>1</sup> : aur c d l r <sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> : eius, aur f l <sup>3</sup> : unique order	Et processit {rumor eius statim} in omnem regionem Galilaeae  { } order +statim, aur d f l
1:29	Et <sup>1</sup> protinus <sup>2</sup> egredientes de synagoga uenerunt in domum Simonis et Andreae cum Iacobo et Iohanne.  <sup>1</sup> : f ff <sup>2</sup> l <sup>2</sup> : f l	Et protinus egredientes de synagoga uenerunt in domum Simonis et Andreae cum Iacobo et Iohanne.
1:30	<b>Discumbebat</b> autem socrus Simonis febricitans	<b>Decumbebat</b> autem socrus Simonis febricitans
1:31	Et accedens eleuauit eam	Et accedens eleuauit eam
1:31	Et eleuauit eam <b>adprehendens manum</b> <sup>1</sup> eius.	Eleuauit eam <b>adprehensa manu</b> eius

	<sup>1</sup> :> <b>adprehendit</b> ] ( <i>b c q</i> ) manum eius ( <i>c</i> ). > <b>adprehensa</b> manum eius ( <i>aur ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>l</i> ), > <b>adprehendens manum eius</b> , unique	
1:31	Et <b>confestim</b> <sup>1</sup> , dimisit eam febris  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Et <b>continuo</b> dimisit eam febris
1:31	Et confestim dimisit eam febris et ministrabat eis <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c f ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>l r</i> <sup>1</sup>	Et <b>continuo</b> dimisit eam febris et ministrabat eis
5:31	Quis me tetigit?	Quis me tetigit?
5:33	Mulier autem timens et tremens, sciens quod factum esset (et cetera)	mulier autem timens et tremens, sciens quod factum esset
5:33	Et procidit ante eum, et dixit ei omenm ueritatem	Et procidit ante eum et dixit ei omnem ueritatem
5:34	Ille autem dixit ei: Filia, fides tua te saluam fecit	Ille autem dixit ei; Filia fides tua te saluam fecit
5:34	Fides tua te <b>sanauit</b> : uade in pace	Fides tua te <b>saluam fecit</b> : uade in pace
5:35	Ueniunt ab archisynagogo dicentes: quia filia tua mortua est: quid ultra <sup>1</sup> uexas magistrum?  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur f l</i>	Ueniunt ab archisynagogo dicentes: quia filia tua mortua est: quid ultra uexas magistrum?
5:36	Noli timere, tantummodo <sup>1</sup> crede  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur d f i l q r</i> <sup>1</sup>	Noli timere tantummodo crede
5:37	Et non admisit quemquam sequi se nisi Petrum et Iacobum et Iohannem fratrem Iacobi	Et non admisit quemquam sequi se nisi Petrum et Iacobum et Iohannem fratrem Iacobi
5:38	Et <b>uenit</b> <sup>1</sup> in domum archisynagogi, et <b>uidit</b> <sup>2</sup> tumultum <sup>3</sup> et* flentes et heiulantes <sup>4</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a c f ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> : <i>f ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>l</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>a aur l</i> <sup>4</sup> : <i>aur l (-em) f</i>	Et <b>ueniunt</b> <sup>1</sup> in domum archisynagogi et <b>uidet</b> <sup>2</sup> tumultum et* flentes et heiulantes <b>multum</b>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur b d l q</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>a aur c d i</i>
5:39	Et ingressus ait eis: Quid turbamini et ploratis? Puella non est mortua, sed dormit.	Et ingressus ait eis: Quid turbamini et ploratis? Puella non est mortua. Sed dormit.
5:40	{Et} <sup>1</sup> inridebant eum  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur f l</i>	{Et} inridebant eum
5:40	Ipse uero <b>abiectionis</b> <sup>1</sup> omnibus {} <sup>2</sup> <b>adsumpsit</b> <sup>3</sup> patrem et matrem puellae  <sup>1</sup> : unique. > <b>adiecta</b> , <i>ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> : <i>om. foris, a aur l</i>	Ipse uero <b>eiectis</b> <sup>1</sup> omnibus <b>adsumit</b> <sup>3</sup> patrem et matrem puellae  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur f l</i>

	<sup>3</sup> : <i>a c</i>	<sup>3</sup> : <i>aur l</i>
5:40-41	Et ingreditur ubi erat puella iacens, et tenens manum puellae	Et ingreditur ubi erat puella iacens et tenens manum puellae
5:41 <sup>1</sup>	Talitha kumi: quod <b>interpretatur</b> , Puella surge <b>mihi</b> .	Talitha cumi quod <b>est interpretatum</b> , Puella <b>tibi</b> dico surge.
5:42	Et confestim surrexit puella, et ambulabat	Et confestim surrexit puella et ambulabat.
5:42-43	Et obstupuerunt stupore maximo <sup>1</sup> , et praecepit illis uehementer <b>ut tacerent et nulli dicerent</b> <sup>2</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c d fff<sup>2</sup> i q</i> ; Turner, <i>Oldest Manuscript</i> , 92. <sup>2</sup> : unique	Et obstipuerunt stupore maximo et praecepit illis uehementer <b>ut nemo id sciret</b> .
5:43	Et dixit dari <b>ei</b> manducare.	Et dixit dari <b>illi</b> manducare.
8:1-2	In diebus illis, cum turba multa esset Iesu, nec haberent quod <b>manducaret</b> <sup>1</sup> , conuocatis discipulis ait illis: Misereor <b>turbae</b> , quia ecce triduo { <b>sustinuit</b> }, nec habent quod manducent.  <sup>1</sup> : unique singular	In illis diebus, <b>iterum</b> cum turba multa esset nec haberent quod <b>manducarent</b> , conuocatis discipulis ait illis: Misereor <b>super turba</b> quia ecce <b>iam</b> triduo { <b>sustinent me</b> }, nec habent quod manducent.
8:3	Si dimisero eos ieiunos in domum suam, deficient.	Si dimisero eos ieiunos in domum suam deficient.
8:22	Et ueniunt Bethsaidam: et adducunt ei caecum, et rogant <b>illum</b> ut <b>eum</b> tangeret	Et ueniunt Bethsaidam: et adducunt ei caecum, et rogabant <b>eum</b> ut <b>illum</b> tangeret.
8:22	Et rogant eum, ut illum tangeret	Et rogabant eum ut illum tangeret
8:23	Et <b>adprehendit</b> <sup>1</sup> manum caeci, et eduxit eum extra uicum  <sup>1</sup> : <i>b i q r<sup>1</sup> (d)</i>	Et <b>adprehendens</b> <sup>1</sup> manum caeci, eduxit eum extra uicum  <sup>1</sup> : <i>fff<sup>2</sup> l</i>
8:23	Eduxit eum extra uicum et expuens in oculos eius, inpositis manibus suis.	Eduxit eum extra uicum et expuens in oculos eius, inpositis manibus suis
8:23	Et expuens in oculos eius, inpositis manibus suis, interrogauit eum si aliquid uideret	Expuens in oculos eius inpositis manibus suis interrogauit eum si aliquid uideret.
8:23	Et interrogauit eum si quid uideret.	Interrogauit eum si aliquid uideret.
8:24	Et <b>suspiciens</b> <sup>1</sup> ait* <sup>2</sup>	Et <b>aspiciens</b> <sup>1</sup> ait

<sup>1</sup> Jerome makes an argument for **mihi**: Si diceret, Talitha kum, interpretaretur, Puella surge: nunc uero quia dixit, Talitha kumi, interpretatur de syra et hebraea lingua surge mihi. Kumi, hoc est, surge mihi. Uidete ergo mysterium in ipsa lingua hebraea et syra. Quasi diceret: Puella, quae mater esse debebas, propter infidelitatem puella facta es. Et aliter possumus dicere: Quia renascaris, puella uocaberis. Puella surge mihi: non tuo merito, sed mea gratia. Mihi ergo surge: quod sanaris, non [est] ex tuis uirtutibus

	<sup>1</sup> : unique	<sup>1</sup> : all Jülicher ex- <i>a</i> ( <b>respiciens</b> ) <i>c</i> ( <i>om.</i> )
8:24	Suspiciens ait: Uideo homines ueluti arbores ambulantes	Et aspiciens ait: Uideo homines uelut arbores ambulantes
8:25	Deinde inposuit iterum manus super oculos eius	Deinde iterum inposuit manus super oculos eius
8:25	<b>Et posuit iterum</b> manus <b>suas</b> <sup>1</sup> super oculos eius et coepit uidere.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c</i> ; <i>om.</i> above.	<b>Inposuit</b> manus super oculos eius et coepit uidere.
8:25	Et restitutus est ut uideret clare omnia	Et restitutus est <b>ita</b> ut uideret clare omnia
8:26	Et misit illum in domum suam, dicens: Uade in domum tuam, {et in uicum ne introieris}, <b>et</b> <sup>1</sup> nemini dixeris.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Et misit illum in domum suam, dicens: uade in domum tuam, {et si in uicum introieris}, nemini dixeris.
9:1	Amen dico uobis, quia sunt quidam de hic <b>adstantibus</b> <sup>1</sup> qui non gustabunt mortem.  <sup>1</sup> : unique	Amen dico uobis, quia sunt quidam de hic <b>stantibus</b> qui non gustabunt mortem.
9:1	Quia sunt quidam de hic adstantibus qui non gustabunt mortem, donec uideant regnum Dei	Quia sunt quidam de hic stantibus qui non gustabunt mortem donec uideant regnum Dei.
9:1	Qui non gustabunt mortem	Qui non gustabunt mortem
9:2	Et post dies sex <b>adsumpsit</b> Iesus Petrum et Iacobum et Iohannem, et ducit illos in montem excelsum seorsum solos, et transfiguratus est coram <b>eis</b> .	Et post dies sex <b>adsumit</b> <sup>1</sup> Iesus Petrum et Oacobum et Iohannem, et ducit illos in montem excelsum seorsum solos, et transfiguratus est coram <b>ipsis</b>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>l</i> Vulgate
9:5	<b>Domine uis ut</b> <sup>1</sup> tria tabernacula faciamus, tibi unum <b>Moysi</b> unum, et Heliae unum?  <sup>1</sup> : unique; <i>om.</i> uis, <i>aur l</i> Vulgate	<b>Rabbi bonum est hic nos esse et faciamus</b> tria tabernacula tibi unum et <b>Mosi</b> unum et Heliae unum?
9:6	{Non enim <b>sciebant</b> <sup>1</sup> } quid <b>loquerentur</b> <sup>2</sup> , erant enim timore <b>perterriti</b> <sup>3</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : <i>a c d ff<sup>2</sup> n q</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>b</i>	{Non enim <b>sciebat</b> } quid <b>diceret</b> <sup>2</sup> , erant enim timore <b>exterriti</b> <sup>3</sup> .  <sup>2</sup> : <i>b f ff<sup>1</sup> i l q r<sup>1</sup></i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>c d ff<sup>2</sup> i q</i>
9:6-7	Hic est Filius meus carissimus, <b>hunc</b>	Hic est Filius meus carissimus, audite

<sup>2</sup> Jerome argues for a counter-Vulgate rendering. "Pulchre dixit ἀναβλέψας, hoc est suspiciens, qui quamdiu caecus erat deorsum aspiciebat: sursum aspexit, et sanatus est.

	audite. Et statim circumspicientes neminem {} <sup>1</sup> uiderunt nisi Iesum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>om.</i> unique	<b>illum</b> . Et statim circumspicientes neminem <b>amplius</b> uiderunt nisi Iesum.
9:1	Et post dies sex <b>adsumens</b> Iesus Petrum et Iacobum et Iohannem.*	Et post dies sex adsumit Iesus Petrum et Iacobum et Iohannem.
9:1-2	Et ducit illos in montem excelsum seorsum solos, et transfiguratus est coram ipsis, et uestimenta eius facta sunt splendentia et candida nimis.	et ducit illos in montem excelsum seorsum solos, et transfiguratus est coram ipsis, et uestimenta eius facta sunt splendentia candida nimis.
9:2	Qualia fullo <b>non potest in terra</b> <sup>1</sup> facere  <sup>1</sup> : in terra, unique	Qualia fullo <b>super terram non potest candida</b> facere
9:3	Et apparuit illis Helias cum Moyse, et erant loquentes cum Iesu.	Et apparuit illis Helias cum Mose et erant loquentes cum Iesu
9:4	Et respondens ait Petrus Iesu: Rabbi bonum est nos hic esse	Et respondens Petrus ait Iesu: Rabbi bonum est hic nos esse
9:4/5	Rabbi, bonum est nos hic esse: faciamus tria tabernacula, tibi unum et Moysi unum et Heliae unum.	Rabbi bonum est hic nos esse et faciamus tria tabernacula tibi unum et Mosi unum et Heliae unum
9:6	Et facta est nubes <b>obumbrans</b> eos	Et facta es nubes <b>obumbrans</b> eos
9:6	Facta est nubes <b>ψωτινῇ</b> lucida, et uenit uox de nube, dicens: Hic est Filius meus carissimus, <b>ipsum audite</b> <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>f</i>	Facta est nubes <b>obumbrans</b> eos, et uenit uox de nube dicens: hic est Filius meus carissimus, <b>audite illum</b> <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c i l.</i> (audite eum), <i>a d n r</i> <sup>1</sup>
9:7	Et statim circumspicientes neminem amplius uiderunt	Et statim circumspicientes neminem amplius uiderunt nisi Iesum tantum secum
MAT T 21:9	Et clamauit, turba praecedens et sequens: Osanna filio Dauid, benedictus qui uenit in nomine Domini, osanna in <b>excelsis</b> .	Turbae autem quae praecedebant et quae sequebantur clamabant dicentes: osanna Filio David, benedictus qui venturus est in nomine Domini osanna in <b>altissimis</b> .
11:11	Et <b>intrauit</b> <sup>1</sup> <b>Dominus Iesus</b> <sup>2</sup> <b>Hierosolymam</b> <sup>3</sup> in templum: et* circumspectis omnibus <sup>4</sup> , cum iam uespera esset hora, exiuit in <b>Bethaniam</b> <sup>5</sup> cum duodecim  <sup>1</sup> : <i>q</i> <sup>2</sup> : <b>+Iesus</b> , <i>c f.</i> Hiero. <b>+Iesus</b> , <i>q</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>i l</i> , acc: <i>c r</i> <sup>1</sup> <sup>4</sup> : <i>aur l</i>	Et <b>introiuit</b> <sup>1</sup> {} <sup>2</sup> <b>Hierosolyma</b> <sup>3</sup> in templum: et* circumspectis omnibus, cum iam uespera esset hora, exiuit in <b>Bethania</b> <sup>5</sup> cum duodecim  <sup>1</sup> : <i>l</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>om.</i> Iesus, <i>cet.</i> <sup>3</sup> : <i>a aur b d f ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>q</i>

	<sup>5</sup> : <i>b d fff<sup>2</sup> i l q r<sup>1</sup></i>	<sup>5</sup> : <i>a aur c</i>
11:12	{Et alia die} cum exirent	Et alia die cum exirent
11:12	Et alia die cum exirent a Bethania, esuriit	Et alia die cum exirent a Bethania esuriit
11:13	Cumque uidesset a longe ficum habentem folia.	Cumque uidesset a longe ficum habentem folia
11:13	<b>Uidit<sup>1</sup></b> ficum habentem folia  <sup>1</sup> : > <b>uidit</b> , unique. <i>om.</i> a longe, unique but cited above as Vulgate/VL	<b>Uidisset a longe</b> ficum habentem folia
11:13	{Et cum uenisset ad eam} <sup>1</sup> , nihil inuenit <sup>2</sup> praeter folia  <sup>1</sup> : {}, <i>l</i> , with slight variations in: <i>q aur f</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>cet. (ex-a)</i>	{Et cum uenisset ad eam,} nihil inuenit praeter folia
11:13	Non enim erat tempus ficorum <sup>1</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fl</i>	Non enim erat tempus ficorum.
11:13	<b>Nondum</b> enim erat tempus	Non enim erat tempus
11:14	<b>Dicit ei Dominus</b> : Iam non amplius in aeternum quiquam ex te fructum <b>manducabit<sup>1</sup></b>  <sup>1</sup> : unique	<b>Et respondens dixit ei</b> : iam non amplius in aeternum quisquam fructum ex te <b>manducet</b>
11:15	Et ueniunt Hierosolymam. Et cum <b>intrasset<sup>1</sup> in<sup>2</sup></b> templum, coepit eicere uidentes et ementes <b>de<sup>3</sup></b> templo: et mensas nummulariorum et cathedras uendentium columbas <b>subuertit<sup>4</sup></b>  <sup>1</sup> : unique <sup>2</sup> : <i>all (ex- l)</i> <sup>3</sup> : unique <sup>4</sup> : unique	Et ueniunt Hierosolymam. Et cum <b>introisset<sup>1</sup> {}</b> templum, coepit eicere uidentes et ementes <b>in<sup>3</sup></b> templo; et mensas nummulariorum et cathedras uendentium columbas <b>euertit<sup>4</sup></b>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a aur c fff<sup>2</sup> i l</i> <sup>2</sup> : {} <i>om.</i> in, <i>l</i> <sup>3</sup> : all <sup>4</sup> : all
11:16	Et non { <b>dimittebat ut deferrent quodquam uas</b> } per Templum  {}: fully unique	et non <b>sinebat ut quisquam vas transferret</b> per templum ( <i>F</i> )
11:17	Scriptum est {} <sup>1</sup> “Domus mea domus orationis uocabitur omnibus gentibus.” Uos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronam.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a b c d fff<sup>2</sup> i q r<sup>1</sup></i>	Scriptum est <b>quia<sup>1</sup></b> “Domus mea domus orationis uocabitur omnibus gentibus.” Uos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronum.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur fl</i>
13:32	De die autem illo <b>et<sup>1</sup></b> hora nemo scit, neque angeli in caelo, neque Filius,	De die autem illo <b>uel<sup>1</sup></b> hora nemo scit, neque angeli in caelo, neque Filius,

	nisi Pater.  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a d f i q r</i> <sup>1</sup>	nisi Pater  <sup>1</sup> : <i>aur c ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>l</i>
13:33	Uide <sup>1</sup> te et uigilate et orate: nescitis enim quando tempus sit  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c</i>	Uide <sup>1</sup> te uigilate et* orate: nescitis enim quando tempus sit.
13:35	Uigilate ergo: necistis enim quando dominus domus ueniat.	Uigilate ergo: nescitis enim quando dominus domus ueniat.
14:3 <sup>3</sup>	Et cum esset Bethaniae in domo Simonis leprosi et recumberet, uenit mulier habens alabastrum unguenti <b>pistici</b> <sup>1</sup> pretiosi.  <sup>1</sup> : + <b>nardi</b> ] pistici, <i>aur d f i. om.</i> nardi + pistici, unique	Et cum esset Bethaniae in domo Simonis leprosi et recumberet, uenit mulier habens alabastrum unguenti <b>nardi spicati</b> <sup>1</sup> pretiosi. ( <i>F</i> )  <sup>1</sup> : <i>c ff</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>l q r</i> <sup>1</sup>
14:3	Et effudit super caput eius	Effudit super caput eius
14:4	{Erant autem quidam} <sup>1</sup> indigne ferentes <sup>2</sup> .  <sup>1</sup> : {}, <i>aur f l q</i> <sup>2</sup> : <i>aur f l</i>	{Erant autem quidam} indigne ferentes.
14:4?	Quid <b>prodest</b> <sup>1</sup> ista <b>perditio</b> <sup>2</sup> ?  <sup>1</sup> : unique inclusion <sup>2</sup> : ~ista perditio, <i>f</i>	<b>Ut</b> quid <b>perditio</b> ista <sup>2</sup> ?  <sup>2</sup> : ~perditio ista, <i>a aur d i l</i>
14:5?	{ <b>Potuit</b> <sup>1</sup> uenumdari trecentis denariis} <sup>2</sup>  <sup>1</sup> : <i>a r</i> <sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> : identical <i>k</i>	<b>Poterat</b> enim unguentum istud ueniri plus quam trecentis denariis
14:6	Sinite eam quid <b>ei</b> molesti estis? Bonum opus operata est in me.	Sinite eam quid <b>illi</b> molesti estis? Bonum opus operata est in me.

<sup>3</sup> Nardi in Codex Sangal., F CXXXVIX (Vulgate)



**Incidentals<sup>4</sup>**

Column 1 presents the Homily and individual section where the citation can be found. Column 2 is the Biblical Citation. Columns 3 and 4 are the *Homilies* and Vulgate respectively.

1a	L 1:5-8	Fuit sacerdos Zacharias nomine, et iste in uice sua...	Fuit (in diebus Herodis regis Iudaeae sacerdos quidam) nomine Zaccharias de uice.
1a	Mt 11:8	Ecce qui mollibus uestiuntur in <b>domo</b> regnum sunt (11:7, Jerome has <b>in deserto</b> instead of Vul. in desertum)	Ecce qui mollibus vestiuntur in <b>domibus</b> regum sunt.
1b	J 3:30,29	Illum oportet crescere, me autem minui. Qui habet sponsam, sponsus est: amicus autem sponsi <b>gaudio gaudet</b> , si uideat sponsum.	Illum oportet crescere, me autem minui. Qui habet sponsam sponsus est: amicus autem sponsi qui stat et <b>audit</b> eum <b>gaudio gaudet</b> propter uocem sponsi hoc ergo gaudium meum impletum est.
1b	J 1:29	Ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi	Ecce agnus Dei, qui tollit peccatum mundi.
1b	Mt 5:28	Amen, amen dico uobis, qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam, iam moechatus est eam in corde suo.	Ego autem dico vobis quoniam omnis, qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam, iam moechatus est eam in corde suo.
1b	Mt 5:27?	Scriptum est, in Lege non adulterabis.	Audistis quia dictum est antiquis non moechaberis
1b	Mt 5:28	Qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam, iam moechatus est eam in corde suo.	Qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam, iam moechatus est eam in corde suo.
1b	Mt 3:2	Paenitentiam agite: adpropinquauit enim regnum caelorum.	Et dicens paenitentiam agite: adpropinquauit enim regnum caelorum.
1b	Mt 24:28	Ubi cumque fuerit corpus, illuc congregabuntur aquilae. (Locustas...)	Ubi cumque fuerit corpus, illuc congregabuntur aquilae.
1b	J 3:29	Qui habet sponsam, sponsus est	Qui habet sponsam, sponsus est.
1c	J 1:33	Super quem uideris Spiritum <b>sanctum</b> descendentem et manentem.	Super quem uideris Spiritum descendentem et manentem.
1c	J 1:33	Super quem uideris Spiritum <b>sanctum</b> descendentem et manentem <b>in eo ipse est.</b>	Super quem uideris Spiritum descendentem et manentem <b>super eum hic est.</b>
1c	L 6:12	Solus recedebat in montem, et ibi tota nocte orabat.	factum est autem in illis diebus exiit in montem orare et erat pernoctans in oratione Dei.

<sup>4</sup> That is, citations from the Gospels which are incidental to the commentary of the primary Gospel text. In other words, incidental citations are not the text being commented on by Jerome but is rather Gospel text used in support of Jerome's commentary. See, Alexander Souter, 'Notes on Incidental Gospel Quotations in Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel,' *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. 42 (1941), 12-13.

2a	Mc 1:7	Uenit fortior me post me, cuius non sum dignus procumbens soluere corrigam calciamentorum eius.	Uenit fortior me post me, cuius non sum dignus procumbens soluere corrigam calciamentorum eius.
2a	J 3:30	Illum oportet crescere, me autem minui	Illum oportet crescere me autem minui.
2a	Mc 1:8	Ego <b>baptizo</b> uos <b>in</b> aqua (hoc est Lex) ille uero baptizabit uos in Spiritu sancto	Ego <b>baptizavi</b> uos aqua ille uero baptizabit uos Spiritu Sancto (solid vul)
2a	L 17:21	Et regnum Dei intra uos est	enim regnum Dei intra vos est
2a	Mt 11:12	A diebus Iohannis Baptistae regnum caelorum uim patitur, et uiolenti <b>diripiunt</b> illud. (CM omits nunc) [Found in ZG Φ]	A diebus autem Iohannis Baptistae <b>usque nunc</b> regnum caelorum uim patitur, et uiolenti <b>rapiunt</b> illud.
2a	L 15:17	Quanti mercenarii sunt <b>in domo</b> patris mei	Quanti mercennarii patris mei <b>abundant</b>
2b	Mt 5:21,27(31/32)	<b>Scriptum est in Lege:</b> Non occides, non dimittes uxorem.	<b>quia dictum est antiquis:</b> non occides ... non <b>moechaberis</b> ( <b>dimiserit</b> uxorem)
2b	J 8:44	Pater uester mendax est, et ab initio mendax est sicut et pater eius.	Uos ex patre diabolo estis et desideria patris uestri uultis facere ille homicida erat ab initio et in ueritate non stetit quia non est ueritas in eo cum loquitur mendacium ex propriis loquitur quia mendax est et pater eius.
2b	J 8:44	Mendax est, et ab initio mundi ueritatem non loquitur (hoc est) mendacium loquitur et est pater eius (hoc est ipsius mendacii)	<b>Ab initio et in ueritate non stetit quia non ueritas in eo cum loquitur mendacium ex propriis loquitur quia mendax est et pater eius.</b>
2b	Mt 17:20	Hoc genus non <b>exit</b> nisi in multis <b>ieiuniis</b> et <b>orationibus</b> <sup>5</sup>	Hoc <b>autem</b> genus non <b>eicitur</b> nisi per <b>orationem</b> et <b>ieiunium</b> (CM)
2c	J 1:26	<b>Medius inter uos stat quem uos nescitis</b>	<b>Medius autem uestrum stetit quem uos non scitis.</b>
2c	L 17:21	Regnum Dei intra uos est	Enim regnum Dei intra uos est
3	J 16:33	Uade in pace. Ego uici mundum	Haec locutus sum uobis ut in me pacem habeatis, in mundo pressuram habetis sed confidite ego uici mundum.
4	Mc 6:35	Ecce die tota expectant te	Et cum iam hora multa fieret accesserunt discipuli eius dicentes desertus est locus hic et iam hora praeteriuit.
4	Mc 8:2	Ecce iam triduo sustinent me.	Ecce iam triduo sustinent me.

<sup>5</sup> Augustine Sermo 80.3 Hoc genus non eicitur, nisi ieiuniis et orationibus

4	Mt 22:14	Multi <b>enim</b> sunt uocati, pauci uero electi	multi <b>autem</b> sunt uocati, pauci uero electi. ( <i>CM</i> )
5	Mc 8:21	Nondum intellegitis?	Nondum intellegitis?
5	Mc 10:47	Miserere mei, fili Dauid	Fili David <b>Iesu</b> , miserere mei
5	Mc 10:50	Exiuit et sua uestimenta dereliquit, et sic cucurrit	Qui proiecto uestimento suo exiliens venit ad eum
5	J 8:56	Abraham uidit diem meum, et <b>laetatus est</b>	Abraham <b>pater uester extulauit ut uideret</b> diem meum
6	L 9:28?	(in Euangelio habes secundum Matthaeum): Et factum est die octaua	Factum est autem post haec uerba fere dies octo.
6	L 9:31	Et <b>adnuntiabant</b> illi quo genere passurus esset in Hierusalem	Et <b>dicebant</b> excessum eius quem completurus erat in Hierusalem (solid vul.)
7	Mt 21:5	Et sedit in asina subiugali	et sedens super asinam et pullum filium subiugalis
7	J 12:13?	Et occurrit ei multitudino	?
7	Mt 21:9	In excelsis (above)	<i>c.f.</i> above
8	Mt 15:24	Non ueni, nisi ad oues <b>perditas</b> domus Israhel ( <i>CM</i> )	Non sum missus nisi ad oues <b>quae perierunt</b> domus Israhel (solid vul)
8	L 13:6-7	<b>Ecce iam tertio uenio huc, et fructum quaero, et non inuenio; dimitte me, et succidam eam</b>	<b>Ecce anni tres sunt ex quo uenio quarens fructum in ficulnea hac non inuenio, succide ergo illam.</b>
8	L 13:8-9	Dimitte Domine adhuc et istum annum, et circumfodiam illam et mittam stercus, et si quidem fecerit fructum.	Domine dimitte illam et hoc anno usque dum fodiam circa illam et mittam stercora et si quidem fecerit fructum .
8	L 13:9	Si non fecerit, tunc uenies et succides eam	Sin autem in futurum succides eam
9	J 2:13?	Et ecce in azymis uenit Iesus	?
9	J 2:15	<b>Et fecit sibi flagellum et coepit eicere eos</b>	<b>Et cum fecisset quasi flagellum de funiculis et omnes eiecit de templo</b>
9	Mc 1:16-20	Et factum est cum transiret Iesus secundum mare Galilaeae: <b>uidit duos componentes</b> retia sua, filios Zebedaei, et dixit eis: ‘Dimitte eos, et uenite, sequimini me.’ Et illi statim relicto rete, naue, et patre Zebedaeo, statim secuti sunt eum.	et praeteriens secus mare Galilaeae: uidit Simonem et Andream fratrem eius mittentes retia in mare erant enim piscatores et dixit eis Iesus: venite post me et faciam vos fieri piscatores hominum et protinus relictis retibus secuti sunt eum et progressus inde pusillum uidit Iacobum Zebedaei et Iohannem fratrem eius et ipsos in navi componentes retia et statim vocavit illos et relicto patre suo Zebedaeo in navi cum mercennariis secuti sunt eum
9	Mt 9:9	Et ecce cum transiret, uidit	et cum transiret, <b>inde Iesus</b> uidit

		quemdam hominem nomine Matthaum, et <b>dixit ei</b> , ‘Sequere me.” <b>Et dimisit omnia</b> , et secutus eum.	hominem <b>sedentem in teloneo</b> Mattheum nomine, <b>et ait illi</b> “sequere me.” <b>Et surgens</b> , secutus est eum (solid vul)( <i>CM</i> )
9	Mt 10:8	Gratis accepistis, gratis date	gratis accepistis, gratis date.
9	Mt 21:12	Et cathedras uendentium columbas <b>subuertit</b> <sup>6</sup>	Et cathedras vendentium columbas <b>euertit</b> .
9	Mt 23:2	Super cathedram <b>Moysi</b> sederunt scribae et Pharisei	Super cathedram <b>Mosi</b> sederunt scribae et Pharisei
9	J 2:16	<b>Uos autem fecistis eam domum negotiationis.</b>	<b>Nolite facere domum Patris mei domum negotiationis.</b>
10	J 1:3	Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil	Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil
10	J 12:24-25	Granum <b>tritici</b> , nisi mortuum fuerit <b>in terra [ZPC]</b> , non facit plures fructus	Nisi granum <b>fumenti</b> cadens <b>in terram</b> mortuum fuerit, ipsum solum manet si autem mortuum fuerit multum fructum adfert
10	L 11:52	Qui habent clauem scientiae, et ipsi non <b>intran</b> t; sed et eos qui <b>intrare uolunt, non sinunt [not Vul]</b>	Uae uobis legis peritis quia tulistis clauem scientiae, ipsi non <b>introistis</b> ; et eos qui <b>introibant prohibuistis</b>
10	L 3:23	Erat annorum triginta	Erat incipiens quasi annorum triginta

<sup>6</sup> Matches Comm Mat 21:12-13 in *subuertit*, but slightly different order

## Chapter 8

### Vulgate Paul and Pelagius

Jerome addressed his Gospel revisions to Pope Damasus in the early 380's as a *pious labor, sed periculosa praesumptio* in what has since been read as the Vulgate introduction to the Gospels. However, to what extent the accompanying Vulgate documents are the pious work of Jerome is a matter that necessitates further exploration. The assumption that Jerome is the originator of the totality of the Latin Vulgate edition of the New Testament is impractical and has been disregarded in recent studies. In the course of the last century, scholarship has felt comfortable only in assigning the four Vulgate Gospels to the editorial pen of Jerome.<sup>1</sup> My research at present concentrates on the inconsistencies attendant in the history of the Vulgate's creation, and I must add here – perhaps provocatively and without further comment – that ascribing the text to an author based solely on the paratext is not sufficient evidence of origination. However, a richer picture of the milieu in which the edition was compiled can be built through a critical analysis of the material that introduces its subject. The introduction to the Vulgate *Corpus Paulinum*, though lacking attribution, through criticism is revelatory of the editor's source materials. The striking similarity to the Marcionite Pauline paratexts demonstrates the piecemeal production of the patchwork Vulgate.

---

<sup>1</sup> F. Cavallera, 'Saint Jerome et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épîtres, et de l'Apocalypse', *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (1920), 269-92, for which a good summary can be found in J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome* (London, 1975), 88-9 'Yet in recent years the unlikelihood, not to say impossibility, of this traditional view (the previously popular attribution to Jerome) has progressively forced itself upon scholars'.

The introduction to the Vulgate *Corpus Paulinum*, commonly referred to by its incipit *Primum Quaeritur (PQ)*, consists of three sections. The leading section is a justification of the canonical inclusion of ten Pauline letters as a new Decalogue so that ‘the New Testament may be shown to be in harmony with Old Testament and that it may itself not contradict the Law of Moses.’<sup>2</sup> The second section defends the inclusion of *Hebrews*. The final section, to which is devoted the majority of this chapter, consists of a specific introduction of the reasoning behind each Pauline epistle in order. When dissected the introductions can be seen as heavily dependent on the Pauline paratexts identified as Marcionite by D. de Bruyne, P. Corssen, K.T. Schäfer, and recently as the work of Marcion himself by M. Vinzent.<sup>3</sup> The reliance on a Marcionite text, regardless of whether the author of the *PQ* knew of its history, is striking in a document that validates the letters of Paul as a complement to the Law of Moses.

Eric W. Scherbenske’s recent *Canonizing Paul* (2013) has further argued that the Gospels are where Jerome’s New Testament work began and concluded. Scherbenske is the most recent in a long line to ascribe the authorship of at least this Vulgate introduction of Paul, the *PQ*, to Rufinus of Syria.<sup>4</sup> We will return to the possibilities of authorship later in this chapter. In order to attempt such identification, a thorough critical observation of the Vulgate introduction to the Pauline Epistles is important to make sense of this complicated document. As will be demonstrated, the *PQ* neatly parallels the Pauline paratexts found in Old Latin and Vulgate manuscripts often attributed to Marcion. The inherent contradiction of a work with potential Pelagian

---

<sup>2</sup> ‘Ut ostenderet Novum non discrepare a Ueteri Testamento et se contra legem non facere’.

<sup>3</sup> Donatien de Bruyne, ‘Prologues bibliques d’origine Marcionite’, *Revue bénédictine* 14 (1907), 1-16; Peter Corssen, ‘Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes’, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 10 (1909), 1-45; K.T. Schäfer, ‘Marcion und die ältesten Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen’, *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, 1 (1970), 135-50; M. Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, (2014), 156-80.

<sup>4</sup> All mentions of Rufinus in this paper, unless otherwise qualified, are to Rufinus of Syria, a distinct individual to the otherwise more common Rufinus of Aquileia found often in the story of Jerome.

origins with anti-Marcionite support for the Old Testament including a set of Marcionite parallels is demonstrative of its piecemeal construction.

This chapter will demonstrate the parallels between the components of the *PQ* and its Marcionite predecessor. In so doing, we will unravel the complexity of its composition and seek to better understand the commentator's intentions and shed some light on the compilation of the Vulgate *Corpus Paulinum*. If there exists an 'intrinsically reflexive relationship' between commentary and the text commented,<sup>5</sup> we should expect that the *PQ* originally came bundled with the following Latin Vulgate Pauline Epistles. It follows that further identification of the translator of Vulgate Paul could be more confidently stated with identification of the author of the *PQ*. However, while precise identification of the *PQ*'s specific author has been attempted, such attempts naturally rely on assumptions to fill abundant blanks in the history. Rather, this chapter seeks to understand the original source material from which the unknown author built his commentary. Thus, I shall argue that the identification of the traces of the Marcionite prologues in this typically Vulgate Paul introduction speaks to the nature of amalgamation of the Vulgate as a whole.

### **Marcionite prefaces v. *PQ***

The *PQ* is included earliest in the two oldest Vulgate MSS of Paul, F and A, and thus must be considered to have been written no later than 546. For the purposes of this chapter, F shall be the dominant focus given its early dating and relative completion.<sup>6</sup> The third section of the *PQ* introduces each of the following Pauline epistles in its preferred and Vulgate order: *Rom.*, *1-2Cor.*, *Gal.*, *Laod./Eph.*, *Phil.*, *Col.*, *1-2Thess.*, *Heb.* The order is noticeably different than the Marcionite order: *Gal.*, *1-2Cor.*, *Rom.*, *1-*

<sup>5</sup> S. Lunn-Rockcliffe, 'Prologue Topics and Translation Problems in Latin Commentaries on Paul', J. Lössl and J.W. Watt (eds), *Interpreting the Bible and Aristotle in Late Antiquity* (Surrey, 2011), 33-47, 42.

<sup>6</sup> The *Codex Amiatinus* (A) is from the early 8<sup>th</sup> Century whereas the *Codex Fuldensis* (F) was written between 541 and 546. This manuscript (F) is the earliest available for the *PQ* and a Vulgate Paul. As we will see below, the text represented is necessarily much older than 546. F's text of the *PQ* is in accord with the later MSS and serves as our earliest point of reference. For an overview of these Vulgate manuscripts, see B. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, (Oxford, 1968), 77.

*2Thess.*, *Laod./Eph.*, *Col.*, *Phil.*, *1-2Tim.*, *Titus*. Notably, the *PQ* starts with *Romans*, does neither include *Titus* nor *Timothy*, but includes *Hebrews*, for which it devotes a defence in the previous section. This order was apparently crucial for the compiler of the *PQ*. Just before the *PQ*'s main introduction to *Rom.*, the author notes that 'it bothers some why the Letter of the Romans should be placed first, because obviously it was not written first'.<sup>7</sup> It is clear that the author was working against a manifestly different tradition and was set to correct what he saw as errant compilations likely based on the well-known Marcionite order. The final argument in favour of including *Heb.* further demonstrates the author's understanding of his audience's reticence to accept non-traditional texts. I have tabulated the differing orders between the Marcionite/*Vetus Latina* orders and the *PQ*/Vulgate order as follows:

### Marcionite Order v *PQ*

<b>Marc</b>	<i>Gal.</i>	1- <i>2Cor.</i>	<i>Ro</i> <i>m.</i>	1- <i>2Thess</i>	( <i>Laod.</i> <i>)Eph.</i>	<i>Col.</i>	<i>Phil.</i>	1- <i>2Tim.</i>	<i>Titus</i>
<b><i>PQ</i>.<sup>8</sup></b>	<i>Rom.</i>	1- <i>2Cor.</i>	<i>Gal.</i>	( <i>Laod.</i> <i>)Eph.</i>	<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Col.</i>	1- <i>2Thess.</i>	<i>Heb.</i>	

<sup>7</sup> 'Movet etiam quosdam quare Romanorum epistula in primo sit posita, cum eam non primum scriptam ratio manifestet' (*PQ* 27-8).

<sup>8</sup> For a list of variations in Vulgate MSS, especially incomplete Pauline collections and inclusions of *Laod.*, see Berger (1893) 341-42.



An obvious central theme for a Marcionite text is a preoccupation with Paul's mission to correct the false teachings of the Judaizing 'Pseudo-Apostles'. The *PQ* inherits this concept of correction of falsehoods and echoes the Marcionite prologues in *Gal.* and *Phil.* In *Gal.*, the *PQ* notes Paul's admonishment of the Galatians for their 'belief in the sophistries of the *pseudoapostolis*',<sup>9</sup> whereas the Marcionite prologue notes that they were 'tempted by the *falsis apostolis*'.<sup>10</sup> *Phil.* provides an even closer parallel. The *PQ* suggests that the Philippians were '*conlaudantur* more and more for not wanting to hear the *falsos apostolos*'.<sup>11</sup> The Marcionite prologue similarly states that the Philippians 'did not receive the *falsos apostolos*' and for this Paul *conlaudat* the Philippians.

Indirect references to the Judaizing false apostles can be found throughout the *PQ*. For example, the Marcionite introduction to *Cor.* suggests that some of the Corinthians had been subverted by the *falsis apostolis* of *legis Iudaicae*. The *PQ* takes some of the Marcionite force away from its predecessor but still relies on its structure, stating that Paul sought to 'rebuke those who did not rebuke the *peccantes*'.

When we pull each section from the *PQ* and examine it in parallel with the Marcionite prologues, its derivative nature becomes apparent. Nine of the ten sections of the *PQ* have direct matches in the Marcionite prologues, with the notable exception of *Heb.* that we will deal with further in a moment.

Scherbenske has noted that the seemingly Pelagian *PQ* included among the otherwise Marcionite Pauline prolegomena in manuscripts like F stands as a competing hermeneutical study.<sup>12</sup> Certainly the inclusion of both sets of introductory material in our extant MSS is indicative that neither prefatory tradition had been exclusively

<sup>9</sup> 'callidissimis pseudoapostolis crediderunt' (*PQ* 39-40).

<sup>10</sup> 'temptati sunt a falsis apostolis' (Marcionite Galatians).

<sup>11</sup> 'multo magis conlaudantur qui nec audire falsos apostolos uoluerunt' (*PQ* 41-2).

<sup>12</sup> E. Scherbenske 'The Vulgate *Primum Quaeritur*', *SP* 44 (2010), 139-44; Scherbenske contends that the *Codex Fuldensis* is proof of early MSS themselves serving as platforms for praetextual criticism in debate.

selected or considered heterodox with the other. Just as the Marcionite introductions appear throughout MSS, whether OL or Vulgate, so too was the *PQ* considered intrinsic to the Hieronymian Vulgate and appears exclusively with Vulgate MSS; it is thus appropriate to not only consider the *PQ* a proper Vulgate introduction to the Pauline letters but to consider the introduction as intrinsic to the Vulgate tradition attributed to Jerome, regardless of its veritable authorship. This chapter explores the areas where the two Pauline introductions are in accord, how such accord might be interpreted, and the greater implications regarding the purpose of the *PQ* when its originality is considered.

The subsections for which this paragraph will devote the largest part of its review in the *PQ* are found in its concluding third section. This final part deals with each of the ten letters of Paul it assigns to the parallel decalogue of the New Testament. Curiously, its congruency with the otherwise anti-Judaizing text of the Marcionite prologues makes this section stand out among its claim for a new law that nonetheless ‘lauds the law so much as to put it on equal footing with the gospels and Paul’.<sup>13</sup> If this is so, why should the author have used and preserved Marcionite arguments which consider Judaizers ‘false prophets’? After a critical reading of the *PQ* in context, there are two likely possibilities: either the author sloppily and contradictorily used existing OL Marcionite prolegomena to fill out his argument, or the author inherited this section adding his argument for the decalogue and rounding it out with *Hebrews*, ignorant of its source and its true meaning. I favour the second possibility and will demonstrate that the *PQ* as we have it today relies on another earlier and lost reinterpretation and ordering of the Marcionite prolegomena.

---

<sup>13</sup> E. Scherbenske, ‘The Vulgate *Primum Quaeritur*’ (2013), 197.

### The *PQ* Formula

The introductions, outside of the extended introduction to *Rom.* and the original introduction to the non-Marcionite *Heb.*, follow a simple paradigm based on the familiar Marcionite prologue model. Each section begins with the name of the Pauline addressee, however without the geographical information found in the Marcionite examples, and follows with the reasons Paul had for contact with each particular Church community. For example, where the Marcionite paratext has *Galatae sunt Graeci* the *PQ* has *Galatae iam nullius criminis arguuntur* forgoing description of their location for exposition of their reasons for Pauline redress. As I will demonstrate further, the reasons given are consistent with, and at times copied from, those given in the Marcionite paratexts.

Thus, the *PQ* can be divided into three primary sections:

- 1) A response to those who question the need for Pauline Epistles in canon
- 2) An extended argument for the inclusion of *Hebrews* to round out a decalogue similar to the commandments
- 3) A series of short introductions to the letters in the style of Marcion that concludes with another argument in favour of *Hebrews*. We will focus on this last part in this paragraph and its similarities to the argumenta of the OL versions that are attributed to Marcion.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> So M. Vinzent in his book *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (2014) who argues for the distinct Marcionite elements of the prefaces following P. Corssen, 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes' (1909) and P. de Bruyne, 'Prologues Bibliques d'Origine Marcionite' (1907). For an argument to the contrary see N. Dahl, 'The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters,' *Semeia* 12 (1978), 233-77 which is recently countered by E. Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum* (Oxford, 2013), 237-42.

In order to understand and develop a pattern of similarity between the Marcionite prefaces and the corresponding *PQ* examples found in Section 3, I have set side-by-side the two different sources where the same epistle is discussed.<sup>2</sup> Under scrutiny, it becomes clear that the *PQ* relied heavily upon the Marcionite argumenta prefatory material and utilised its formula to develop its parallelism. Each *PQ* subsection for individual epistles opens with the name of the addressed community – albeit truncated from the longer definition of the community found in the Marcionite argumenta. Then, the *PQ* discusses the reasons for Paul’s writing that is very often either paraphrastically or directly borrowed from Marcion.

The *PQ*’s parallels with the Marcionite texts follow this pattern of fronted audience with missing geographical material – otherwise ubiquitous in the Marcion version – and subsequently Paul’s castigations of wayward communities for trust in ‘false prophets’ or approvals of communities on the straight and narrow. The sections that most strongly break this formula are the first and last, that is *Romans* and *Hebrews*; these sections will form the bulk of our considerations after the examination of the parallels in this part of our present chapter. Unique also in the *PQ* is its propensity to quote directly from the scripture that it introduces, often with rather curious omissions when compared to the expected Vulgate text. The intention of the following parallels and explorations is to understand the strengths of similarities and to question its differences. A further consideration is offered in depth below in an attempt to provide a solution for why such discrepancies might exist.

---

<sup>2</sup> I have maintained the order of their discussion as found in the *PQ*, however it is important to note that the typical Marcionite preface order is different and a comparison of the two is laid out in the last table of this section.

**Marcion v. *Primum Quaeritur***

In this section, each individual introduction from the *PQ* will be separated and introduced in parallel with the Marcionite paratexts that I suggest are the original source for the author of our document. In the following parallels I present the Marcionite edition compiled and translated by Markus Vinzent in his recent *Studia Patristica Supplement on Marcion and the dating of the Synoptic Gospels* on the left-hand side,<sup>3</sup> and the Vulgate edition from *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* with my own translations on the right-hand side. I encourage the Latin reader to consider the original texts, especially where I have highlighted particular correspondences in bold. The order is that which is presented in the *PQ* and the line notations follow each Latin quotation for reference. Recall that the last table in this section indicates the differences between the ordering of the *PQ* and the typical Marcionite (and Tertullian) order. Such conflicting order is especially noted in the *PQ* discussion of *Rom.* below.

The following tables work with the order provided in the *PQ* so as to maintain its sequential argument. Individual line references follow each of the examples from the *PQ*. The differences in order should be noted here, but will be discussed at greater length where variation is significant in the following sections. Our first concern will be the *PQ*'s primary placement of *Romans* and its extended apology for such a placement. The *PQ* will also defend the inclusion of its final letter, *Hebrews*, which is not found in older traditions.

---

<sup>3</sup> M. Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (2014), 182-8.

<p><b>Romani</b> sunt in partibus Italiae. Hi praeuenti sunt a falsis apostolis et sub nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi in legem et prophetas erant inducti. <b>Hos reuocat apostolus ad ueram evangelicam fidem</b> scribens eis a <b>Corintho</b>.</p>	<p>Mouet etiam quosdam quare <b>Romanorum</b> epistula in primo sit posita, cum eam <b>non primum scriptam</b> ratio manifestet. Nam hanc se proficiscentem Hierosolymam <b>scripsisse</b> testatur, cum <b>Corinthios</b> et alios ante iam, ut ministerium quod secum portaturus erat colligerent, litteris adhortatus sit. Unde intelligi quidam uolunt ita omnes epistulas ordinatas, ut prima poneretur quae posterior fuerat destinata, ut per singulas epistulas gradibus ad perfectiora <b>ueniretur</b>. (27-32)</p> <p><b>Romanorum</b> namque plerique tam rudes erant, ut non intellegerent Dei se gratia <b>et non</b> suis meritis esse saluatos, et ob hoc duo inter se populi conflictarent. <b>Idcirco illos indigere adserit confirmari</b>, uitia gentilitatis priora commemorans. (32-35)</p>
<p>The Romans live in the regions of Italy. They had been reached by false apostles and in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ they were misled into the Law and the Prophets. These the apostle calls back to the true evangelical faith, writing to them from Corinth.</p>	<p>It bothers some why the Letter of the Romans should be placed first, because obviously it was not written first. For it is witnessed to have been written when he was heading to Jerusalem, as he had been instructing the Corinthians and others before with letters, and as he collected the ministry which was carried along with him. Thus some want to have all the letters ordered, so that the one should be placed first which was destined to have come later, so that in steps through individual letters he came to perfection.</p> <p>For a great part of the Romans were so unsophisticated that they had not come to understand that they are saved by the Grace of God, not through their own merits. And on account of these two options the people fought among themselves. Thus he asserted that they were in need of strengthening, reminding them of the prior vices of the gentiles.</p>

The first epistle deals with in the *PQ* is *Rom.* and departs from the established previous order. As mentioned earlier, the author knew that such a placement would cause some consternation and thus writes a pre-emptive defence of his reordering. In so doing, the *PQ* implicitly acknowledges the precedence of the Marcionite argumenta in its pre-preface to *Rom.* Having argued for the new order, the *PQ* moves into our established paradigm of an incipit of the name of the community to be addressed, followed by its reasons for address. While the Marcionite *Rom.* suggests the community had fallen afoul of the *falsis apostolis* of 'the Law and Prophets', the *PQ* suggests that an argument between salvation through works or through faith tore the community apart, thus divorcing directly anti-Judaizing concepts from the *PQ*. The two documents are in accord that Paul initiated communication in order to strengthen *euangelicam fidem*, as in the Marcionite example, or through a need to strengthen them in view of 'the prior vices of the gentiles'.<sup>4</sup>

The formula for the *PQ*'s borrowings from Marcion is evident from lines 32-5 in this parallel and we would profit to review it here and follow it with the remaining parallels: the section opens with an introduction of the audience of *Romans*<sup>5</sup> without the geographical references expected in the Marcionite examples, and then discusses the reasons Paul had for his contact with this particular Church community.

In our current example of *Romans*, a certain strong similarity is found in the discussion of Paul's reasons for writing following the introductory material (indicated in bold). What does not follow from the Marcionite example is the first five lines of the *PQ* on *Rom.*, and indeed the beginning of section 3 as outlined above. In this part, the author argues for the primary placement of *Romans* among the list of Pauline Epistles.

---

<sup>4</sup> 'idecirco illos indigere adserit confirmari, uitia gentilitatis priora commemorans' (*PQ* 34-5).

<sup>5</sup> The *PQ* always opens with the audience as the first word of the section (with the notable exception of *Heb.*) but is not always consistent with its case, sometimes using the genitive as here in *Rom.* or nominative in *Gal.*, while the Marcionite examples use the nominative to introduce their addressees throughout.

<b>Corinths</b> sunt Achaici. Et hi similiter ab apostolo audierunt uerbum veritatis et subuersi multifarie a falsis apostolis, quidam a philosophiae uerbosa eloquentia, alii a secta legis Iudaicae inducti sunt. Hos <b>reuocat apostolus</b> ad ueram et euangelicam sapientiam scribens eis ab Epheso per Timotheum.	<b>Corinthians</b> autem iam dicit scientiae gratiam esse concessam, et non tam omnes increpat quam cur peccantes non increpauerint <b>reprehendit</b> , sicut ait: «Auditur inter uos fornicatio », et <i>interum</i> : «Congregatis uobis cum meo spiritu tradere huiusmodi Satanae». (35-38)
<b>The Corinthians</b> are Achaeans. Similarly, also they heard from the apostle the word of truth, but in many ways were subverted by false apostles, some led away by the verbose eloquence of philosophy, others misled by a sect of the Jewish law. These the apostle calls back to the true and evangelical wisdom, writing to them from Ephesus through Timothy.	<b>And now</b> he says that the gift of knowledge has left the Corinthians, as he does not rebuke all of them but rather he faults those who did not rebuke the sinners, saying thus: ‘It is heard that there is fornication among you,’ and also, ‘You assembled with my spirit to give over such a one to Satan.’
Post actam paenitentiam consolatorias scribit eis a Troade et conlaudans eos hortatur ad meliora.	In secunda uero laudantur et ut magis ac magis proficiant admonentur. (38-39)
<b>After penitence</b> was made, he writes consolatory words to them from Troas, and also praising them he exhorts them on to better things.	<b>In the following [second] (2Cor)</b> truly they are praised that as they are admonished they improve more and more.

The two introductions for *1-2Cor.* follow the expected pattern by starting the passage with the name of the community. We touched above on the shared theme between our two texts of *falsis apostolis* found in *Cor.* and the perceived necessity for Paul’s correction. The two introductions to *2Cor.* share the same commentary that Paul’s warnings were effective by the time of his follow-up to the community. ‘Truly *laudantur*, they are praised, for as they are admonished they improve *magis ac magis*, more and more’,<sup>6</sup> the *PQ* says of the community in *2Cor.* The Marcionite predecessor

<sup>6</sup> ‘ut magis ac magis proficiant admonentur’ (PQ 38-9.).



states in parallel that Paul is 'conlaudans eos, praising them, urging them further on *ad meliora*, to better things'.<sup>7</sup>

The *PQ* adds a citation from *ICor.* in introducing the work. Naturally we should expect that the *lemmata* found within the commentary should match the text to be commented, especially if we should wish to claim that the collator and commentator were the same individual. This particular *lemma* deviates. Where the Vulgate has '*In nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi congregatis uobis et meo spiritu cum uirtute Domini Iesu tradere huiusmodi Satanae in iterum carnis ut spiritus saluus sit die Domini Iesu*', our commentary leaves off both references to Christ and reorganizes its opening as '*Congregatis uobis cum meo spiritu tradere huiusmodi Satanae*'. The fronting with '*cum meo spiritu*' and not the invocation of Christ changes the actor to the Apostle and the congregation and action of the Corinthians to the work of Paul's spirit. This curious refocusing of the subject will be seen again in our discussions of *Col.* and *Heb.* to follow.

Again, our established formula is maintained with an opening of the addressee (*Corinthe/Corinthiis*) but with the larger geographical note intrinsic to the Marcionite paratexts absent. The introduction to the second letter in both cases omits an introduction and rather mentions in a short introduction that Paul continued to urge the community to improve. The Marcionite text is one of the strongest worded against the 'sect of the Jewish law'. The *PQ* does not follow this stringent line of attack, but does echo that there are those among them 'who did not rebuke the sinners'.

The references to Paul's letter itself should presumably match the Vulgate translation that it introduces. While the short three words '*auditur inter vos fornicatio*' (*ICor.* 5:1) match the Vulgate, the second passage is truncated from the expected: '*In nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi congregatis vobis et meo spiritu cum uirtute Domini*

---

<sup>7</sup> 'conlaudans eos hortatur ad meliora' (Marcionite Cor.).

*Iesu tradere huiusmodi Satanae in iterum carnis ut spiritus salvus sit die Domini Iesu*'. (1Cor 5:4-5). The absent invocations of Christ and initialisation of the quotation with an ablative suggesting congregation '*cum meo spiritu*', that is Paul's spirit, bizarrely puts an emphasis on the power of Paul rather than Christ. We shall see such an omission of Christ again in *PQ Colossians*, below.

Galatae sunt Graeci. hi uerbum ueritatis primum ab apostolo acceperunt, sed post discessum eius temptati sunt a <b>falsis apostolis</b> , ut in legem et circumcisionem uerterentur. hos apostolus reuocat ad fidem ueritatis scribens eis ab Epheso.	Galatae iam nullius criminis arguuntur, nisi quod callidissimis <b>pseudoapostolis</b> crediderunt. (39-40)
<b>The Galatians are Greeks. At first, they accepted the word of truth from the Apostle, but after his departure they were tempted by false Apostles, so that they converted to the law and circumcision. These the apostle calls back to the faith of truth, writing to them from Ephesus.</b>	<b>The Galatians were accused of no crime except that they believed in the sophistries of the false apostles.</b>

*Gal.* follows the prescribed paradigm and is one of our clearest thematic connections to the Marcionite original. As discussed above, both texts agree that the Galatians had fallen prey to heterodox teaching. The *PQ* stops at mentioning the *callidissimis*, sophistries, of the *pseudoapostolis*, whereas the Marcionite paratext expressly states that these false prophets taught 'the Law and circumcision'. As should be clear at this point, the *PQ* shies away from the overtly anti-Judaizing themes of the Marcionite text but readily borrows from its basic structure.

The parallels for *Galatians* are clear; both the Marcionite text and the *PQ* refer to the Galatians as a church that fell to the temptations and belief in false prophets. Of course, for Marcion, these false prophets are those espousing the Law and circumcision,

and the parallel mention in the *PQ* strikes as either a deliberate echoing of this opinion or an accidental transmission. *Gal.* is one of Paul's most strident attacks against Judaizers, a fact that developed Marcion's negative view toward the so-called Old Testament and the Jewish sect.<sup>8</sup> As such, this passage serves as particularly strong evidence for the *PQ*'s reliance on the Marcionite texts for both form and theme, and hence speaks to the *PQ*'s inadvertent role as a vector of Marcionite dogma.

Laodicensis sunt Asiani. Hos conlaudat beatus apostolus Paulus quod semel accepta <b>fidem euangelicam</b> perstiterunt in uerbo ueritatis scribens eis.	Ephesii sane nulla reprehensione sed multa laude sunt digni, quia <b>fidem apostolicam seruauerunt.</b> (40-41)
<b>The Laodiceans are Asians. These, the apostle Paul also praises that, once they had accepted the evangelical faith, they persisted in the word of truth when he wrote to them.</b>	<b>The Ephesians are soundly worthy of no reproach but rather of many praises because they served the apostolic faith.</b>

Whereas some sections in the *PQ* – such as *Gal.* above – carry over thematic elements and paraphrase longer materials from its source, some – such as *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, and *1-2 Thessalonians* – contain directly lifted phrases. *Ephesians*, occasionally misattributed in *Vetus Latina* texts as *Laodiceans*, notes Paul's approval of the community's service to the apostolic faith, *fidem apostolicam*. This is a clear echo of the praise found in the Marcionite predecessor that states Paul's praise stems from their persistence in the evangelical faith, *fidem euangelicam*. The following *PQ* section dealing with Phil., as discussed above, directly copies the words *falsos apostolos* and the verb *conlaudantur*. The *PQ Thess.* relies heavily on its source and uses the same vocabulary in its introduction in stating that the community *fidem inconcussam*

<sup>8</sup> On Marcion and the origins of his antipathy to Judaism and work against 'Judaizers', the seminal works are A. von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig, 1921) and *id.*, *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (Leipzig, 1923). For a synopsis see F.F. Bruce 'Marcion', in *id.*, *The Canon of Scripture* (Glasgow, 1988), 134-44. A contemporary reexamination of the influential 'heretic' can be found in the recent works of M. Vinzent, *Christ's Resurrection in the New Testament and the Making of the New Testament* (Farnham, 2011) and *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (2014).

*servaverit ueritatis, sed etiam in persecutione ciuium fuerint constantes inuenti*, which neatly carries over the Marcionite's text which states *hi accepto ueritatis perstiterunt in fide etiam in persecutione ciuium suorum*. The exact copying of *persecutione ciuium*, *fide*, and the serving of *ueritatis*, the truth, along with the paraphrased idea of remaining *constantes* or *perstiterunt* leaves little doubt that the author of the *PQ* had the Marcionite paratexts readily available.

Philippenses ipsi sunt Macedones. hi accepto uerbo ueritatis perstiterunt in fide, nec receperunt <b>falsos apostolos</b> . hos apostolus <b>conlaudat</b> scribens eis a Roma de carcere per Epaphroditum.	Philippenses etiam multo magis <b>conlaudantur</b> qui nec audire quidem <b>falsos apostolos</b> uoluerunt. (41-2)
<b>The Philippians themselves are Macedonians. Once they had accepted the word of truth, they persisted in the faith, and did not receive false apostles. These the apostle also praises, writing to them from Rome, from prison, through Epaphroditus.</b>	<b>The Philippians are celebrated more and more as they never wanted to hear those false apostles.</b>

Again, there is no mention of the geography of the Philippians in the *PQ* as we find in the Marcionite text. The parallels otherwise are very strong: both use the verb '*conlaudare*' to demonstrate Paul's praise of the community for rejecting the *falsos apostolos*. The parallels are so strong in this section as to nearly suggest direct copying.

Colossenses et hi sicut Laodicenses sunt Asiani. et ipsi praeuenti erant a <b>pseudoapostolis</b> [cf V Gal. above], <b>nec ad hos accessit ipse apostolus, sed et hos per epistulam recorrigit.</b> audierant enim uerbum ab Archippo qui et ministerium in eos accepit. ergo apostolus iam ligatus scribit eis ab Epheso.	Colosenses autem tales erant ut, <b>cum ab Apostolo uisi corporaliter non fuissent, hac laude digni haberentur:</b> «Et si corpore absens sum, sed spiritu uobiscum sum gaudens et uidens ordinem uestrum.» (42-5)
---	--

<p>The Colossians, they too are Asians, just as the Laodiceans. And even though they had been reached by pseudo-apostles, while the apostle himself had not reached them, even still he corrects them through an epistle. For they had heard the word from Archippus, who also accepted the ministry to them. The apostle therefore, already arrested, writes to them from Ephesus.</p>	<p>The Colossians were such that while they were not seen in the flesh by the Apostle (Paul) they were worthy of praise. 'And although I am absent in body, in spirit I am with you rejoicing and seeing your order.'</p>
---	---

The *PQ* section introducing *Col.* shares the same central concern found in the Marcionite paratext, namely that Paul had never met the community in person and maintained only epistolary contact with the Colossian church. The *PQ* states *cum ab Apostolo uisi corporaliter non fuissent, hac laude digni haberentur*, or, 'while they were not seen in the flesh by the Apostle, they were worthy of praise.' This echoes the Marcionite example that claims that while they had been reached by *pseudoapostoli nec ad hos accessit ipse Apostolus*, that is, 'the Apostle himself had not yet reached them'. As the stated *PQ* concentration on Paul's alienation from his addressee makes up the totality of the section and the majority of the Marcionite paratext, their connection is apparent.

In supporting this concept of Paul's didacticism by proxy, the *PQ* cites a passage from *Col. 2:5*: *Et si corpore absens sum, sed spiritu uobiscum sum gaudens et uidens ordinem uestrum*. As in the aforementioned example found in *1Cor.*, the text here strangely omits the nine following words which would refocus the verse: *et firmamentum eius quae in Christo est fidei uestrae*. Again, the author of the *PQ* has presented a verse to lay the emphasis upon the work of Paul and the order he praises within his Pauline church community. We will return to this in a moment, but the *PQ* clearly exhibits Pauline tendencies even if the author was ignorant of the putative origin of the Marcionite texts.

*Col.* is missing a further geographical description, as can now be expected based on the consistency of this feature in above examples. Furthermore, the locations of historical places in the creation of the letter are missing, such as Paul's writing from Ephesus. The bulk of the conversation in both examples regards Paul's writing to the Colossians despite never having physically visited them. Both examples on *Col.* discuss Paul's lack of direct contact. For the *PQ*, this again suggests that the author was relying on the Marcionite example.

As in *Cor.* above, we should expect that the quotations from Paul should match the Vulgate, and it does. However, the given example is shortened and *Col* 2:5 should follow as: '*ordinem vestrum et firmamentum eius quae in Christo est fidei vestrae*'. References to Christ are again missing, if not potentially removed. Only their order is remarkable, not also their firmament of faith in Christ. Thus, the passage when read with its omissions seemingly advocates the ordered community of Pauline Christianity over faith. This is explicable when we consider the Marcionite text that again argues against the reception of false prophets into their community and upright standards of ministry. As the Marcionite edition makes no mention of faith in Christ, it follows that a *PQ* reliant on its Marcionite predecessor should omit such a mention as well. To include the longer quotation would have perhaps required the *PQ* to make theological pronouncements on faith independently from its Marcionite guideposts.

Thessalonicenses sunt Macedones in Christo Iesu. hi accepto uerbo ueritatis <b>perstiterunt</b> in <b>fide</b> etiam in <b>persecutione civium</b> suorum; praeterea nec receperunt ea quae a falsis apostolis dicebantur. hos conlaudat apostolus scribens eis ab Athenis.	<b>Thessalonicenses</b> nihilominus in duabus epistulis omni laude prosequitur, eo quod non solum <b>fidem</b> inconcussam servauerit ueritatis, sed etiam in <b>persecutione civium</b> fuerint <b>constantes</b> inuenti. (45-7)
---	--

The Thessalonians are Macedonians in Christ Jesus who, after the word of truth was accepted, persisted in the faith even during the persecution by their fellow city; furthermore, they did not receive those things that were said by the false apostles. These the apostle praises, writing to them from Athens.	The Thessalonians, nevertheless, in two epistles are followed by all praise, not only because they served the unshaken faith of Truth, but also that they were found standing together against the persecution of their fellow city.
Ad Thessalonicenses scribit et notum facit eis de temporibus nouissimis et de aduersarii detectione. scribit ab Athenis.	Ø
To the Thessalonians he writes and makes note to them concerning the very novel times and of the detection of the adversary. He writes from Athens.	

The *PQ* section on *Thess.*, as previously alluded to, directly lifts the concept of ‘*persecutione ciuium*’ from its predecessor. Like all of our previous nine examples, it follows with its sub-incipit of the name of the group to be addressed, followed by Paul’s reasons for educating the group at hand.

In our last example in parallel, again the *PQ* drops the geographical location of its addressee. The parallels in the body of the introduction are very strong. The bolded sections show a direct copying of the Marcionite work ‘*in persecutione civium*’ and the similar discussions of ‘*fide(m)*’ and ‘*perstiterunt/constants*’. Not only are the concepts in accord but also the *PQ* directly mimics entire phrasings.

Ø missing in F	De Hebraeis uero quid dicendum est, quorum Thessalonicenses qui plurimum laudati sunt imitatores facti esse dicuntur, sicut ipse ait: «Et uos fratres imitatores facti estis ecclesiarum Dei quae sunt in Iudaea, eadem enim passi estis et uos a contribulibus uestris quae et illi a Iudaeis.» Apud ipsos quoque Hebraeos eadem commemorat dicens: «Nam et uinctis compassi estis et rapinam bonorum uestrorum cum gaudio suscepistis cognoscentes uos
----------------	--

	habere meliorem et manentem substantiam.>> (47-53)
	Truly, something ought to be said of Hebrews, of whom the highly praised Thessalonians are said to be imitators, as he puts it: ‘And you, brothers, have become imitators of the churches of God which are in Judea. You have suffered the same from your own tribesmen as they had from the Jews.’ In regard to these Hebrews he also points out the same things, saying: ‘You had compassion for prisoners and with joy you accepted the plunder of your goods knowing that you had a greater and lasting substance.’

Our final letter in the *PQ* introduction is the non-Marcionite *Heb*. As mentioned before, the second section of the *PQ* argues that its inclusion is important to round out a proper New Testament Decalogue. Similarly, this final section reads more as a defense of its addition to the corpus than an introduction to the work. The different structure can also be explained by its lack of source material, that is a lack of a Marcionite paratext for *Heb*. The author of the *PQ* endorses *Hebrews*, opening the section similarly to that of *Rom*. by stating ‘*de Hebraeis uero dicendum est*’, ‘truly something ought to be said of the Hebrews’, rather than something akin to ‘The Hebrews were a group truly worthy of praise, etc.’ In order to endorse the document, we read that the ‘Thessalonians are said to be imitators [of the Hebrews].’<sup>9</sup> The author then continues with two Pauline citations of support, one of which requires further investigation. The passage in question is from

<sup>9</sup> ‘Thessalonicenses ... imitatores facti esse dicuntur’ (PQ 47-53).



1*Thess.*, and as per our established pattern, strangely omits a reference to Christ. The *PQ* states '*et uos fratres imitatores factis estis ecclesiarum Dei quae sunt in Iudaea, eadem enim passi estis et uos a contribulibus uestris quae et illi a Iudaeis*'. The omission of '*in Christo Iesu*' after '*ecclesiarum Dei quae sunt in Iudaea*' stands out and refocuses the leadership of the Church not on the body of Christ, but on the contemporaneous leadership of Paul.

The section on *Heb.* reads more as support for its inclusion and not a didactic introduction for the text to come. This is unsurprising given its lack of Marcionite predecessor. The reasoning for this is two-fold: the author of the *PQ* lacked a template from which to build his paratext, and the author needed to argue for the inclusion of a text which went against the well-established tradition linked to the Marcionite paratexts.

This introduction breaks from the other Marcion-paralleled texts by speaking '*de Hebraeis*' rather than *Hebraei* ... etc. It seems the author does not even try to mimic the previous sections, but rather launches his apology for the inclusion of Hebrews. Very little is said of why Paul should write to the community of the Hebrews specifically, and in fact its support is found in a quotation from a separate work 1*Thess.* 2:14.

As seen before, the biblical reference to 1*Thess.* 2:14 lacks the expected reference to Christ. In this case, however, the reference is particularly integral to the original meaning. The Vulgate gives: '*vos enim imitatores facti estis fratres ecclesiarum Dei quae sunt in Iudaea in Christo Iesu quia eadem passi estis et vos a contribulibus vestris sicut et ipsi a Iudaeis*'. The omission of Christ in this instance is certainly striking, given that 'Paul' was speaking to Jewish communities who had accepted Christ in the regions of Judea; yet, the *PQ* frames the reference to 'Churches of God in Judea'.

The amount that this quotation rearranges the expected Vulgate text is certainly odd for a text supposedly introducing the *Corpus Paulinum*. The *PQ* puts in primary focus the appellation with '*et uos fratres imitatores*'. While an argument could possibly

be made that the grammatical sense is maintained and that the *PQ* is simply fronting the subject, it is certainly unnecessary to do so and even more peculiar if we are to expect that this was a preface for our Vulgate form. The latter half is also changed after the aforementioned omission of Christ; the ‘*quia eadem*’ construction is dropped in favour of *eadem* with the postpositive *enim*. The *PQ* quotation is thus rather more concessive than causative compared to the Vulgate version, especially since the *PQ* has removed the reference to Christ. Furthermore, the Vulgate provides ‘*sicut et ipsi a Iudaeis*’ becomes ‘*quae et illi a Iudaeis*’.

The remaining Pauline letters are not mentioned in the *PQ* and therefore provide no further evidence. These pastoral letters do however have Marcionite introductions. They are provided here to further demonstrate that the Marcionite exemplars follow the formula established above and to emphasize their omission in the *PQ*.

Philemoni familiares litteras facit pro Onesimo servo eius. Scribit autem ei a Roma de carcere.	Ø
<b>He composes familiar letters to Philemon on behalf of Onesimus his servant. He writes to him, however, from Rome, from prison.</b>	

  

Timotheum instruit et docet de ordinatione episcopatus et diaconii et omnis ecclesiasticae disciplinae.	Ø
<b>He instructs Timothy and teaches him concerning the ordination to the episcopate and to the diaconate and concerning all</b>	

aspects of ecclesiastical discipline.	
Item Timotheo scribit de exhortatione martyrii et omnis regulae ueritatis et quid futurum sit temporibus novissimis et de sua passione.	Ø
<b>Likewise he writes to Timothy concerning the exhortation to martyrdom and all aspects of the rule of truth, and what will be in the last times, and concerning his own passion.</b>	

Titum commonefacit et instruit de constitutione presbyterii et de spiritali conuersatione et hereticis uitandis qui in scripturis Iudaicis credunt.	Ø
<b>He warns and instructs Titus concerning the constitution of the presbytery and concerning spiritual conversation and heretics to be avoided who believe in the Jewish scriptures.</b>	

### Rufinus and Pelagian Possibilities

Unfortunately, identification of a specific author of the PQ is more difficult than the identification of its influences. H.J. Frede suggested two possible camps from which we can derive its origin: Augustine or Pelagius.<sup>10</sup> The Pelagian suggestion has since been constructively explored and has much to commend it.<sup>11</sup> A further intriguing possibility, Rufinus of Syria, brings the text tantalizingly close to the work of Jerome. Seen as one

<sup>10</sup> H.J. Frede, 'Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften', in *id.*, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel*, 4 (Freiburg, 1964), and *id.*, *Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses* (Freiburg, 1966-1971), 42-3.

<sup>11</sup> See G. de Plinval, 'Précisions sur l'authenticité d'un prologue de Pélage: *Primum quaeritur*', *RA* 12 (1966), 247-53.

of the Church's proto-Pelagians, and as an irony of Church History, this Syrian Rufinus was a close associate of anti-Pelagian Jerome who sent him as a legate on his behalf to Rome. Yet, the fact that this Rufinus seemed to espouse proto-Pelagian views has led many to suggest that there were at least three distinct Rufini: the Aquilean, the Syrian, and a third Pelagian.<sup>12</sup> However, the preponderance of evidence and contemporary scholarship supports that the Syrian and proto-Pelagian are the same character.<sup>13</sup> As Elizabeth Clarke notes, the fact that this Rufinus of Syria's work, the *Liber de fide*, exhibits a particularly anti-Origenist perspective, especially during the great Origenist controversy, further supports his proximity to Jerome.<sup>14</sup> But the certainty of its attribution to anyone character in Church History without definitive biographical evidence found within the *PQ* leads mostly to speculation.

It is far easier to state impossibilities than possibilities. The strongest of these impossibilities is that this final edition of the *PQ* was the work of Jerome. The inclusion of *Hebrews* does not match with what we know of Jerome's opinions on the letter. Chapter V on Paul of his *De viris illustribus* states that *Hebrews* 'is not credited to him, on account of its different style and manner of speaking'.<sup>15</sup> This contradiction in support for *Hebrews* between the known opinions of Jerome and the *PQ* has found a common resolution in scholarship that the *PQ* must necessarily not be Jerome's.<sup>16</sup> Such

<sup>12</sup> The proto-Pelagian Rufinus attested by Caelestius is declared by H. Marrou in 'Les Attaches Orientales du Pelagianisme', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 112 (1968), 459-72, 463-5 as necessarily a distinct Rufinus not to be associated with Jerome.

<sup>13</sup> G. Bonner 'Rufinus the Syrian and African Pelagianism', *AugStud* 1 (1970), 30-47; Eugene Te Selle, 'Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius: Explorations in the Prehistory of the Pelagian Controversy', *AugStud* 3 (1972), 61-95, 61-5; E.A. Clark *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, 1992), 202-7; T.S. de Bruyn, *Pelagius's Commentaries on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford, 1993), 18-24, and E. Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul* (2013) esp. 183-4.

<sup>14</sup> E.A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy* (1992), 203.

<sup>15</sup> Jerome, *De vir. ill.* V: 'Epistola autem quae fertur ad Hebraeos, non eius creditur, propter styli sermonisque dissonantiam, sed vel Barnabae, iuxta Tertullianum, vel Lucae Evangelistae, juxta quosdam, vel Clementis Romanae postea Ecclesiae Episcopi, quem aiunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornassem sermone'.

<sup>16</sup> So H.J. Frede, *Epistolae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos* (Freiburg, 1975), 99-101, and B. Fischer 'Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache', in Kurt Aland (ed.), *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (Berlin, 1972), 73.

contradictions in the formation of the *PQ* adds depth to the understanding of the Vulgate and its creation as a collection of the work of many editors, and not a monolithic creation of Jerome. In lieu of the preceding considerations of Jerome's involvement in Vulgate *Matthew* and *Mark*, it is important to evaluate the origin of the Latin Vulgate's *Epistles*. Insofar as we might reject Jerome as the final editorial pen for the Vulgate's *Corpus Paulinum*, we might consider this Marcionite influenced Vulgate introduction to the *Corpus* to be revelatory of its compilation.

There rests a possibility that our text at hand is not the second in the chain from the Marcionite paratexts, and thus the possibility remains that an original *PQ* did not include *Heb.* at its end. However, the most important aspect of the *PQ* is its prosaic nature. In collating the original Marcionite *capitula* into a single longer introduction to a Pauline Decalogue, the author of the *PQ* was making a statement on the collective nature of his Latin translation. By the time the *PQ* first appears in F and A, its purpose is to impose upon its readership the intrinsic and theological link between its ten Pauline letters.

In conclusion, the author of the *PQ* had sought to use readily available texts that had established the first Pauline corpus to introduce the ten letters as sharing common themes. The exact identity of the author may never precisely be identified, nor is it so simple to demonstrate the *PQ*'s author was likewise the translator of the material it introduces. What is however safe to say is that the author of the *PQ* worked with common texts that we now call Marcionite. The author clearly did not exhibit strong Marcionism in his text, as especially evidenced by his preference to bolster the Old with the New Testament, but was still an empathetic transmitter of some of the Marcionite texts Pauline sensibilities.

## Chapter 9

### Afterword

Having analysed some of the most complete texts of Jerome's available Latin copies of *Matthew* and *Mark*, I will now set my sights on providing a conclusion and possible solution to our aforementioned inconsistencies. I have titled this final chapter 'Afterword' in place of the rather more conventional 'Conclusion' to emphasize the still rather murky situation of Vulgate authorship. This is not to suggest that I do not believe some concluding solutions may be provided – in fact, a few such conclusions will be reached in this chapter from the evidence discussed in this thesis. However, I believe that the clearest 'conclusion' is that the bulk of the Vulgate tradition in *Matthew* and *Mark* does not resemble the precise text of the two gospels Jerome had used until his last days. In effect, it is Jerome's presupposed authorship that is inconclusive. This 'Afterword', then, will survey the primary obstacles to accepting Jerome as the pure origin of our Vulgate text of *Matthew* and *Mark*, and by extension, the Vulgate as a whole. In so doing, I will evaluate two possibilities, namely that Vulgate *Matthew* and *Mark* are either only in part the work of Jerome or in no part the work Jerome produced in the late fourth century.

The certainty of Jerome's direct and sole involvement in all four of the Vulgate Gospels may be doubted. However, the dissemination of the Vulgate text families as delineated by Berger, Chapman, Souter, Metzger, et al., and discussed above in the chapter on 'Vetus Latina and Vulgate' defines the very existence of a clear Vulgate

tradition.<sup>1</sup> The Vulgate is a loose assortment of like Latin translations<sup>2</sup> that were copied diversely leading to 'endless contamination'<sup>3</sup> necessitating numerous 'successive efforts' to what was hitherto thought to 'restore Jerome's original version'.<sup>4</sup> Restorational or editorial efforts were most famously pursued by 'Alcuin, Theodulf, Lanfranc, and Stephen Harding'<sup>5</sup> in antiquity and more recently by Wordsworth and White of Oxford in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century, and Weber and Gryson of the Stuttgart edition in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century. And yet, as Brown Tkacz summarises Berger's lament, the full history of the Vulgate from its first creation remains 'still virtually impossible to write'.<sup>6</sup>

This impossibility stems from what little is known with certitude. As discussed above, even the associated Hieronymian introduction to the Vulgate Gospels has no inextricable relationship with the document it ostensibly introduces. A true original is nowhere to be found. The assortment of 'Vulgate' makes the ascertainment of truly 'Vulgate' forms in many cases a subjective business.<sup>7</sup>

Alexander Souter's chapter on 'Patristic (and Other Early) Citations' in his *Text and Canon* seeks to briefly survey the texts in use in a number of Patristic authors. He sets pages 85-92 in exploration of Latin Patristic authors, of which page 89 introduces three of the most important authors for this dissertation: Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius. Of course, the importance of Jerome is beyond question. A discussion of Augustine's role is significant in understanding the contemporaneous adoption of a Vulgate text. But the third author, Pelagius, might rightly strike the reader as relatively

---

<sup>1</sup> Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, (1893); Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*, (1908); Souter, *Text and Canon of the New Testament*, (1913) 47-54; Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (1964/2005) 105-109.

<sup>2</sup> Berger (1893), x.

<sup>3</sup> Souter (1913), 51.

<sup>4</sup> Metzger (1964) 106.

<sup>5</sup> Metzger (1964) 106.

<sup>6</sup> Brown Tkacz, (1996), 53. She says this to summarize Berger's frustration at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, for which she cites 'Il serait désirable qu'il fut bientôt possible d'écrire une histoire de la Vulgate... ils (nos travaux) seront toujours incomplets, nos vues seront partielles et nos résultats imparfaits.'

<sup>7</sup> One need only look at the efforts of the Oxford and Stuttgart editions and their *Apparatus* for evidence.

out of place. Indeed, he lived in the same epoch as the preceding two. Yet, his influence on the story of the Vulgate's creation is not commonly discussed. Recall our discussion on the *Corpus Paulinum's* Vulgate Introduction, the *Primum Quaeritur*. Certain Marcionite elements were inadvertently copied into this Vulgate introduction; however, we were more easily able to conclude some degree of 'Pelagian' intervention in the text. It was further speculated that such a 'Pelagian' force could be reasonably assumed to be behind the translation that it introduces, namely the Vulgate *Corpus Paulinum*.

Pelagius's commentary on the *Corpus Paulinum* created and disseminated around 409 includes a Scriptural text that, Souter writes, 'appears to be Vulgate, as it agrees constantly with either *Fuldensis* or *Amiatinus*'.<sup>8</sup> He continues 'if the text used by Pelagius be really pure Vulgate throughout, it is the earliest of all extant authorities for the Vulgate of the Pauline Epistles, and the divergences of leading Vulgate MSS from the text used by him will have to be explained.'<sup>9</sup> What explanation could we possibly give when we understand that Jerome is at least not the source of the Vulgate *Corpus Paulinum*?<sup>10</sup> And while, unfortunately, Pelagius's work on the Gospels is insufficient for an equivalent analysis, is not Souter's connection striking?

Returning to his aforementioned Jerome and Augustine, his comments lend further context. On Jerome, 'extensive in his knowledge of various types of text', is less committed to consistency of usage of the Vulgate. 'In Luke he certainly used the *a* type,' he writes.<sup>11</sup> This claim may be extended to some instances of Jerome's *Matthew* and *Mark*, as explored by this dissertation. Souter places Jerome's Acts in the camp of *gig* and *p* and his *Corpus Paulinum* to *d* and *m*. This ignorance of the Vulgate ironically comes, of course, from the supposed editor of the Vulgate.

---

<sup>8</sup> Souter (1913) 89.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.* 89.

<sup>10</sup> Which on this page Souter notes Jerome's Epistles text, 'show[ed] points of contact with *d*, *m*, Lucifer, and Ambrosiaster.' 89.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.* 89.



On Augustine, Souter claims that his Gospels were until 400 like *e*, but thereafter 'he used the Vulgate for long citations' but adds that 'he still cited from memory in short passages'.<sup>12</sup> Houghton's concentrated enquiry on Augustine's text of John adds precision to his date of adoption; 'he begins to cite Jerome's revised text in primary citations from around 403' for fifteen years when around 418 his text becomes exclusively Vulgate-like.<sup>13</sup> From 418 'Vulgate readings begin to displace his customary versions in these references,' he writes, 'although even in his latest works there are still features characteristic of his mental text.'<sup>14</sup> In his extensive analysis of Augustine's John, he notes that only 85 of his 306 citations are 'distinctive Vulgate readings' –again, primarily post-418.<sup>15</sup>

What are we to make of the early fifth century adoption of the Vulgate? Certainly, such a later date would be less troublesome if Jerome had himself consistently included Vulgate readings from the early 380's; it could be concluded hence that its dissemination was at fault. However, as Pelagius is the 'earliest of all extant authorities for the Vulgate of the Pauline Epistles,'<sup>16</sup> and in any case Jerome cannot be so neatly tied to the Gospels, it is hardly tenable that the Vulgate New Testament is Jerome's translation. And while some Vulgate-like readings can be found in Jerome, so too can such readings be found in Augustine, Pelagius, Ambrose, and even as early as Tertullian as discussed in our chapter on *Matthew*, above.

My lack of a full conclusion is based on my reticence to stand fully behind my explanation for this phenomenon. From the beginning of my study, I have been struck by the recurrence of Pelagius in the story of the Vulgate. The rampant anti-Pelagianism that followed his career could easily explain a reattribution of any Scriptural collation or

---

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.* 89.

<sup>13</sup> Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John* (2008) 118.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.* 118.

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.* 106.

<sup>16</sup> Souter (1913), 89.

translation made by his own hand.<sup>17</sup> As mentioned above, the paucity of Pelagian Gospel citations makes a similar study in parallel to the Gospels impossible. Thus, I cannot conclude that the Vulgate Gospels are the work of Pelagius, or any individual for that matter.

## Two Options

What can be concluded is that the Vulgate as we know it – as summarised critically in the Oxford then Stuttgart editions – is not the original work of Jerome as presented.

This conclusion can be further subdivided into two subcategories:

- 1) In Part Jerome: The Ship of Theseus. The Vulgate manuscript tradition is an altered text based in some part on an original Gospel translation made by Jerome. However, its appearance in a typically Vulgate form did not occur for 30-160 years after the supposed publication in the 380's. This time span would allow substantial additions and editions intervening on the original Hieronymian text leading to a 'Ship of Theseus' situation (c.f. further discussion below.)
- 2) Not Jerome. The Vulgate manuscript is an original creation by some as yet unidentified editor. Given the numerous disagreements between the writings of Jerome and the accepted Vulgate tradition, Jerome as an original source for the resultant text is just as difficult to claim as any pre-fifth century writer who shares similar renderings. Rather, where Jerome appears to witness Vulgate forms could just as simply be explained as sharing a common late fourth century influence with the Vulgate editor(s).

---

<sup>17</sup> See, for example, Souter's discussion of Cassiodorus's scrubbing of Pelagius's name from his work on the Epistles and his renaming the author 'Primasius', in Souter (1913) 91.

The first option refers to the 'Ship of Theseus', a thought experiment proposed by Plutarch to explore the nature of a thing that has undergone continuous alteration. He asks whether Theseus's ship is still the same object after all of its individual components have been swapped. So too for the Vulgate, I propose option 1 in which I suggest the framework for the Vulgate MSS could have been based on some Hieronymian draft. Working from this template, numerous editors over time may have altered the document to the point that we might rightly question its nature. It has been acknowledged that the Vulgate was seen as a malleable text for centuries until the intervention of a thirteenth century Franciscan, Roger Bacon. Until Bacon's campaign to edit the Vulgate as a stable and unassailable translation, much like various editorial treatments of classical literature, editors were liable to freely edit the work to better act as a contemporary spiritual 'weapon'.<sup>18</sup> Such alteration surely could have occurred from the moment the first edition of a Hieronymian text was produced.

I return then to the issue of the 'Ship' that is the Vulgate. May we properly attribute the resultant text to Jerome and his work in Rome? I mentioned in the conclusion to the chapter on *Matthew* that appearances of seemingly Vulgate forms in the work of Jerome were like glimmers of a Vulgate witness in a jumble of *Vetus Latina* influence. To extend the analogy, this would suggest that *supersubstantialem* at *Matthew* 6:11 was an original plank, as it were, set in Jerome's original Vulgate and not replaced by further editors. This may remain a possibility. However, if the Vulgate is based on Jerome's text, is what remains still Jerome's text any more than the Vulgate is based on *a b d*, et al.? My leading question implies my second option: not Jerome.

In my exploration of this second option I shall recapitulate some of the most important points laid out by this dissertation as a whole.

---

<sup>18</sup> H.H. Glunz, *History of the Vulgate in England* (1933) 14.

## A Summary of Problems

The *Commentary on Matthew*, written by Jerome over a period of two weeks in March 398, provides an unparalleled source for a case study on Jerome's text of *Matthew*. In it, we are told that Jerome was asked by Eusebius of Cremona to comment on an 'historical translation' in his possession. As the text is explicitly stated as a commentary on an existing tradition, and as it was produced in only two weeks, we can be sure that its text represents Jerome's text of *Matthew*.

The underlying text as lemmatized by Jerome in the *CM* demonstrates consistency. For example, the *CM*'s *Matthew*'s treatment of εἰς is consistently different than the Vulgate's treatment. The *CM* chooses an ablative where otherwise the Vulgate expects an accusative. Through the documentation of this phenomenon in no fewer than six places, Jerome's text is seen to be a consistent entity with consistent editorial choices.

The *CM*'s greater significance comes in its copious supply of examples of *Matthew* with which to individually compare to the Vulgate tradition. Seemingly small differences found in Jerome's text become revelatory of grander issues upon closer examination. *Matthew* 5:35 presents *cum illo in uia* for *in uia cum eo* in an otherwise nearly identical citation. In searching the catalogue of Jerome's other works, it was shown that the saint maintained this small variation throughout his career while Augustine in his *De serm. Dom. in monte* 1.29 (written five years prior to the *CM*) demonstrates the Vulgate's *in uia cum eo* (otherwise found only in *k*).<sup>19</sup> Similarly, Jerome's consistent usage of *perditas* for the Vulgate's *quae perierunt* at 15:24 speaks to his ignorance of the Vulgate's innovations.

---

<sup>19</sup> See discussion p. 84-85.

Lexical differences wave red flags as well. Jerome's continued usage of *Vetus Latina* forms innovatively altered in the Vulgate tradition call his relationship with the Vulgate into question. Jerome writes *Matthew* 6:16 in the *CM* with the *Vetus* form *exterminant* where the Vulgate changes to *demoliuntur*; importantly, Ambrose and Augustine in their early works also use *exterminant* suggesting an all-around contemporary ignorance of the Vulgate choice. Jerome even argues for *Vetus Latina* forms in view of potential innovation. For example, at *Matthew* 15:11 he argues for the proper usage of *Vetus communicat* instead of the Vulgate innovation in *coinquinat*. Jerome consistently uses *dimittite* for Vulgate *sinite* at *Matthew* 19:14. Throughout his career, Jerome always uses the liturgical and perfectly acceptable *Vetus Latina excelsis* at *Matthew* 21:9, where the Vulgate famously innovated to *altissimis*.

At times, Jerome exhibits pure innovation himself. At *Matthew* 8:7, Jerome offers the reader *sanabo* against the familiar *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate *curabo*. Indeed, a variety of locations were identified where Jerome is unique in his choices against the body of *Vetus Latina*, Vulgate, and Patristic evidence in the above chapter and in the associated tables (chapter 7) below. It is alluring to suggest that these areas may be demonstrative of the original text produced by Jerome in the 380's; however, such a claim is surely difficult to make securely.

There are still a number of areas where Jerome seems to agree with the Vulgate in a relatively rare rendering. *Matthew* 6:11 and its inclusion of the very Vulgate *supersubstantialem* provides a typically Vulgate translation. The question that was explored is critical: is the Vulgate rendering an innovation or an inheritance. The discussion demonstrated a number of earlier and contemporaneous sources that likewise used similar forms against the more common *cottidianum*. The need to search for further Patristic evidence was urged. *Matthew* 10:18 was utilized as an example of a section, which when set against the bulk of *Vetus Latina* evidence Jerome seems to be

parroting a uniquely Vulgate form. However, Tertullian in his *Scorpiace* 9.4 nearly two hundred years prior demonstrated a nearly identical form as found in the *CM* and the Vulgate. Can relationship between Tertullian and the Vulgate be properly posited? No, at least not as much as may be considered between Jerome and the Vulgate. I declared that any instance in which Jerome may seem to be a witness for the Vulgate text as is known today must be further explored against all available extra-Vulgate, *Vetus Latina*, manuscripts as well as further Patristic evidence.

The table on the *CM* and *Matthew* (chapter 7, table 1) as a whole indicates a number of areas where the Vulgate may seem to agree with Jerome against *a b d*. Further *Vetus Latina* examples were annotated especially in these sections. Throughout *Matthew* 19 as demonstrated by the *CM* seems at many points to be a witness for the Vulgate edition. At 19:9, the *CM* and Vulgate both include five additional words, *et qui dimissam duxerit moechatur*, not found in *a b f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l r<sup>1</sup>*; only *aur c f* and *q* in a modified form include this phrase. In each of the similar manuscripts (*aur c f q*) Vulgate corruption could be reasonably blamed. It might follow logically that Jerome is aware of an unique Vulgate form; however, it might also follow that Jerome is a witness to a similar choice found on the evolutionary line to an evolved Vulgate. So too at 19:27 are found 17 words verbatim to the Vulgate. However, a look at *a b* demonstrates that this long phrase has ancient precedent, but was modified in other later manuscripts.

The number of serious differences confounds the similarities in *Matthew* 19. Vulgate *Moses* is consistently spelled in the typically *Vetus Latina* form of *Moyses* (*a aur b c d f ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> h q r<sup>1</sup>*) in both 19:7 and 19:8. In 19:14, as discussed at length above in the appropriate chapter, Jerome sides only with *d* in choosing *dimittite*, a choice identified in other parts of his career. Twice in 19:23-4, Jerome uses the ablative *regna*, similar only to *a b [ff<sup>1</sup>] ff<sup>2</sup> n*, against the much more common and Vulgate accusative.

As a whole, 19:24-6 presents a host of problems. Some like *regna* or the choice of *saluus fiet* (>*fieri*, *ff*<sup>2</sup>) over *saluus esse* (Vulgate, *a aur b c f ff*<sup>1</sup> *g*<sup>1</sup> *h l n*) suggest a limited range of influences. The rest include unique omissions (*poterit*, *hoc*, *autem omnia*) that suggest a unique rendering. *Matthew* 19:29 in the *CM* suggests an altogether unique verb *recipiet* where the Vulgate continued the acceptable and ancient tradition of using *accipiet*. It is particularly difficult to make sense of minor similarities when presented with significant differences.

The *CM* presents a wealth of evidence of the Hieronymian text of *Matthew* in the midst of his most productive period. The table (chapter 7) was included in the hope of presenting this evidence in a digestible form for further contemplation and study. As I warned in the introduction to the chapter on the *CM*, cherry-picking individual sections or producing pseudo-statistical analysis would only serve to skew the evidence in favour of one conclusion or another. As such, it is my hope that my analysis on significant differences might be supplemented by further study of the text comparison tables found in chapter 4 of this thesis.

### Jerome's Final Project

Jerome's final project makes for an excellent final case study in summation of his text of the Gospels. The *Commentary on Jeremiah* was written sometime in the final three years of his life, and was, as per Kelly, the 'copingstone' of his career.<sup>20</sup> There is certainly no later, clearer piece of evidence for the very latest Gospel text of Jerome. In order to supplement this dissertation's primary focus on *Matthew*, I have created another table on the text based on Reiter's list of lemmata not complying with Vulgate

---

<sup>20</sup> Kelly (1972) 256-7.

forms.<sup>21</sup> This table can be referenced above together with the tables on Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew* and the *Homilies on Mark*. Having set the citations from *Matthew* in this commentary alongside with the Vulgate and additional *Vetus Latina* evidence, as was done with both the *Commentary on Matthew* and the *Homilies on Mark*, once again an inquiry into Jerome's text of *Matthew* can be performed. The evidence in this instance is but a small fraction of what was offered in the *CM*. Nevertheless, these late-career lemmata provide interesting, and characteristically contradictory, samples of Jerome's text of *Matthew*.

The examples are contradictory. This should not come as a surprise given the lack of consistency in Jerome's utilisation of sources throughout his career. Again, Jerome diverges from clear Vulgate forms. Here, however, he at times turns to possible Vulgate readings he previously did not exhibit while still turning away from others he did.

As mentioned above in the chapter on the *CM*, *Matthew* 3:9 is there recorded with *potens est*. We discussed the preference for this form throughout Jerome (and indeed Augustine's) early career. Here now in *Jeremiah*, Jerome has adopted a form found in the Vulgate, *potest*. Of course, this is a relatively small point of contact but bears mentioning due to a reversion of a set course Jerome had demonstrated over a period of some years. Initially such a seemingly late adoption of Vulgate forms may align itself neatly with Houghton's theory of Augustine's adoption of Vulgate-like forms in the period between 403-418.<sup>22</sup> The appeal of the latent implication – i.e. Jerome likewise only at this period 'adopted' the Vulgate – is great given its cure-all possibilities; only later in life did Jerome write the Vulgate. Of course, this would still

---

<sup>21</sup> S. Reiter, *CSEL* 59, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi, In Hieremiam Prophetam Libri Sex* (1913) 441. I have further indicated with typographical marks those citations in the *CM* which cross with *Jeremiah*, as indicated in the key to the tables.

<sup>22</sup> Houghton (2008) 118. See above in this chapter for discussion.



presuppose Hieronymian authorship. More condemnatory to this solution is the rest of *Jeremiah*, which throughout poses further examples again divorcing Jerome from his supposed Vulgate.

Take for example *Matthew* 7:13 in *Jeremiah*. In the *CM* Jerome used *quam* for Vulgate *quia*. The difference is on its face insignificant and bore no use in singling it out for the chapter on the *CM*. Yet, in view of his late career continuation of this use it should be discussed here. *Quam* for *quia* can be found in *a b h l q* and is used as Jülicher's consensus form. Not only does Jerome again use this ancient *Vetus Latina* word in *Jeremiah*, but he includes another variance found also in *a b c h*: the omission of the word *porta*. Such an omission seems a more significant editorial choice than even the substitution of this word. We can thus cross both differences and see Jerome's text of *Matthew* is here something like *a b* and *h*. This life-long preference for an extra-Vulgate *Matthew* 7:13 is all well and good until the last word, typically *perditionem*, is considered. Jerome had used *perditionem* since the *CM*, as well he might given its consistent employ throughout the *Vetus Latina*. And yet here, he innovates yet again and substitutes the expected *perditionem* with *mortem*, a choice for which no *Vetus Latina* precedent is found. Why, if Jerome was suddenly beginning to adopt the Vulgate should he steer so far off course?

Consider also *Matthew* 10:23 and 11:27 in *Jeremiah*. A perusal of the tables in chapter 7 will show Jerome's non-Vulgate choices are unique to a single *Vetus Latina* text: *d*. Why should it be that Jerome, having already shown preference for *a b h* in this text, would now copy clear and significant forms only found in *d*? In 10:23, Jerome now moves away from the Vulgate and bulk of *Vetus Latina* forms which he followed in the *CM* to treat *persequentur* as *persecuti fuerint*. Now he replaces *ista* for *hac*. His new 11:27 uses *cognoscit* twice, in contrast with the two-time usage of *nouit* Vulgate/*Vetus Latina* found in the *CM*. All of these unique changes come from *d*.

So, at the very end of his life, Jerome was correcting some previously consistent non-Vulgate choice to Vulgate. All the same, he was correcting some *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate choices to another *Vetus Latina* form or something of his own creation. When the text was changed to another he seemed to follow readings found also in *a b h* but also *d*. Of course, it would be absurd to suggest that Jerome had begun to incorporate various traditions across numerous groups we now consider to be manuscript families. Furthermore, the creation of *Jeremiah* was never finished and occurred in his very last days, with fleeting health, flagging will, and even an attack by a mob on his monastery.<sup>23</sup> Nor are these examples lemmatised in the same way we enjoyed in the *CM* and the *HM* but are rather the same sort of incidental quotations Souter remarked were indicative of Jerome's 'no particular respect for his own revision'.<sup>24</sup>

As a whole, however, these variations tell much the same story we witnessed above in this dissertation, namely, that Jerome cannot be consistently linked to the Vulgate edition as produced from the earliest. The word 'consistently' is crucial. Without consistent link to Vulgate choices it is a challenge to claim Hieronymian origination. In much the same way Jerome seems to agree at places with the Vulgate uniquely, so too can the same be said of another *Vetus Latina* or Patristic source. If the conclusion is the 'Ship of Theseus' method and an argument is to be built that some rudimentary planks can still be sourced to the writings of Jerome, the number of changes that must have occurred since Jerome's publication make attributing the Vulgate to the saint just as difficult as assigning it to the editor of *a*. Rather, as is evident from the beginning of his career to the very end, Jerome held on to a number of various *Vetus Latina* forms. Sometimes these forms were consistent, indicating their use in some text he was using. Other times they were not so consistent implying an

---

<sup>23</sup> Kelly (1975) 257.

<sup>24</sup> Souter, 'Notes', *JTS* 42 (1941) 13.

evolution or change in his text. But the lack of total consistency suggests that the historically sure attribution of Hieronymus of Stridon to the source of the eventual Vulgate of Trent about 1100 years later is a much more complicated matter and ought to be continually reexamined.

Jerome, himself, made a claim to a Latin edition of the entirety of the Bible in his ultimate, autobiographical chapter of the *de Viris Illustribus*. This work functioned as a familiar self-aggrandizing work of literary politics.<sup>25</sup> His claim to total revision is included among a list of extant works we know Jerome to have completed.<sup>26</sup> We have no reason to believe Jerome was only here embellishing. An effort in Gospel edition, in the least, and full New Testament revision, at the most, must have been attempted. After all, we possess, at a minimum, the *Preface* to this fruit of labor. The ambiguity stems from whether or not the traditionally attached works –the Vulgate Gospels– are the Hieronymian edition or something else entirely.

---

<sup>25</sup> P.B. Harvey, 'Jerome Dedicates his *Vita Hilarionis*', *VC* 59,3 (Aug. 2005) 297.

<sup>26</sup> See Jerome's autobiographical chapter in *De uiris Illustribus* and Kelly (1975) 87.

## Bibliography

### Primary Literature

#### Greek New Testament

Nestle, E. and K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart, 1993).

#### Vulgate

Stuttgart: Weber, Robert and Roger Gryson, *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgata Versionem* (Stuttgart, 1969/2007).

Oxford: Wordsworth, J. and H.J. White, *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi* (Oxford, 1889-98).

#### Vetus Latina

Vercellensis: J. Belsheim, *Codex Vercellensis: Quattuor Evangelia Ante Hieronymum Latine Translata ex Reliquiis Codicis Vercellensis Saeculo ut Videtur Quarto Scripti et ex Editione Iriciana Principe* (1894).

Veronensis: J. Belsheim, *Codex Veronensis: Quattuor Evangelia Ante Hieronymum Latine Translata Eruta e Codice Scripto ut Videtur Saeculo Quarto vel Quinto in Bibliotheca Episcopali Veronensi Asservato et ex Josephi Blanchini Editione Principe* (1904).

Bezae: D.C. Parker et al., *A Transcription of Codex Bezae* as presented on <http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/1664/1/Bezae-Latin.xml>, as accessed between January 2013 and June 2015.

Jülicher, A. *Itala: Das Neue Testament in Altlateinischer Überlieferung*  
vol. 1 *Matthäus-Evangelium* (Berlin, 1972).  
vol. 2 *Marcus-Evangelium* (Berlin, 1970).

### Patristic Sources

#### Ambrose

CSEL 32.1, ed. C. Schenkl (1896).

*Exameron*  
*de Paradiso*

- de Cain et Abel*  
*de Noe*  
*de Abraham*  
*de Isaac*  
*de Bono Mortis*  
 CSEL 32.2, ed. C. Schenkl (1897).  
*de Iacob*  
*de Ioseph*  
*de Patriarchis*  
*de Fuga Saeculi*  
*de Interpellatione Iob et David*  
*de Apologia David*  
*Apologia David Altera*  
*de Helia et Ieiunio*  
*de Nabuthae*  
*de Tobia*  
 CSEL 32.3, ed. C. Schenkl (1902).  
*Expositio Evangelii Secundum Lucan*  
 CSEL 62.5, ed. M. Petschenig (1913).  
*Expositio Psalmi CXVIII*  
 CSEL 64.6, ed. M. Petschenig (1919).  
*Explanatio Psalmorum XII*

### Augustine

- Confessionum, Libri XIII: CSEL 33, ed. P. Knöll (1896).*  
  
*de Consensu Evangelistarum, Libri IV: CSEL 43, ed. F. Weihrich (1904).*  
  
*de Civitate Dei*  
     Part 1, *Libri I-XIII: CSEL 40.1, ed. E. Hoffmann (1899).*  
     Part 2, *Libri XIV-XXII: CSEL 40.2, ed. E. Hoffmann (1900).*  
*Epistulae*  
     Part 1, 1-30: *CSEL 34, ed. A. Goldbacher (1895).*  
     Part 2, 31-123: *CSEL 35, ed. A. Goldbacher (1898).*  
     Part 3, 124-184: *CSEL 44, ed. A. Goldbacher (1904).*

And:

- CSEL 12, ed. F. Weihrich (1882).  
     *Liber qui appellatur Speculum*  
     *Liber de Divinis Scripturis sive Speculum*  
 CSEL 25.1, ed. I. Zycha (1891).  
     *de Utilitate Credendi*  
     *de Duabus Animabus*  
     *Contra Fortunatum*  
     *Contra Adimantum*  
     *Contra Epistulam Fundamenti*  
     *Contra Faustum*  
 CSEL 25.2, ed. I. Zycha (1892).

- Contra Felicem  
de Natura Boni  
Epistula Secundini  
Contra Secundinum  
de Fide contra Manichaeos  
Commonitorium*  
CSEL 28.1, ed. I. Zycha (1893).  
*de Genesi ad Litteram  
de Genesi ad Litteram, Imperfectus Liber  
Locutiones in Heptateuchum*  
CSEL 28.2, ed. I. Zycha (1895).  
*Quaestionum in Heptateuchum Libri VII  
Adnotationum in Iob Liber Unus*  
CSEL 36, ed. P. Knöll (1902).  
*Retractionum, Libri Duo*  
CSEL 41, ed. I. Zycha (1900).  
*de Fide et Symbolo  
de Fide et Operibus  
de Agone Christiano  
de Continentia  
de Bono Coniugali  
de Sancta Virginitate  
de Bono Viduitatis  
de Adulterinis Coniugiis  
de Mendacio  
Contra Mendacium  
de Opere Monachorum  
de Divinatione Daemonum  
de Cura pro Mortuis Gerenda  
de Patientia*  
CSEL 42, eds. C.F. Urba and I. Zycha (1902).  
*de Perfectione Iustitiae Homini  
de Gestis Pelagii  
de Gratia Christi  
de Peccato Originali  
de Nuptiis et Concupiscentia*  
CSEL 60, eds. C.F. Urba and I. Zycha (1913).  
*de Peccatorum  
de Spiritu et Littera  
de Natura et Gratia  
de Natura et Origine Animae  
Contra Duas Epistulas Pelagianorum*

## Jerome

### *Epistles*

- 1-70, CSEL 54, ed. I. Hilberg (1910)  
71-120, CSEL 55, ed. I. Hilberg (1912).  
121-154, CSEL 56, ed. I. Hilberg (1918).  
*Select Letters*, ed. G.P. Goold (London, 1933).

*Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi*

CCSL 79B, ed. A. Canellis (2000).

*Against Helvidius, de Perpetua Virginitate Beatae Mariae Adversus Heluidium*

PL 23, ed. J.P. Migne (1883).

*Commentarii in Epistulas Pauli Apostoli ad Titum et ad Philemonem*

CCSL 77C, ed. F. Bucchi (2003).

*Commentarii in Epistulas Pauli Apostoli ad Galatas*

CCSL 77A, ed. G. Raspanti (2006).

*Commentariorum in Matheum (Commentary on Matthew)*

Emile Bonnard, *Commentaire sur S. Matthieu, Sources Chrétiennes* (1977, 1979).

CCSL 77, eds. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen (1969).

*Contra Rufinum*

CCSL 79, ed. P. Lardet (1982).

*Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*

CCSL 90, ed. C. Moreschini (1990).

*in Hieremiam Prophetam*

CSEL 59, ed. S. Reiter (1913).

*in Marci Evangelium (Homilies on Mark, Tractatus)*

CCSL 78, ed. G. Morin, B. Capelle, J. Fraipont (1958).

## Secondary Literature

**St Anselm's Rome**, *The Revision of the Vulgate: A Report* (Rome, 1909).

**Abbott**, T.K., 'M. Berger's History of the Vulgate,' *Hermathena* 9, no. 20 (1984) 50-55.

**Adkin**, Neil, 'Some Notes on the Style of Jerome's Twenty-second Letter,' *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*.vol. 112 (Turin, 1984) 281-291.

– 'The Date of the Dream of Jerome,' *Studi Classici e Orientali* vol. 43 (Pisa, 1993) 263-273.

– *Jerome on Virginitate: A Commentary on the Libellus de virginitate servanda (Letter 22)* (Oxford, 2003).

**Antin**, Pierre, 'Autour du songe de S. Jérôme,' *Revue des Études Latines*, vol. 41 (Paris, 1963) 350-357.

**Berger**, Samuel, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premier siècles du moyen age* (Paris, 1893).

**Bogaert**, P.-M. 'The Latin Bible: c. 600 to c. 900,' *The New Cambridge History of the Bible from 600 to 1450* (Cambridge, 2012) 69-92.

**Bonner**, Gerald, 'Rufinus of Syria and African Pelagianism', *Augustinian Studies* 1 (Villanova, 1970) 31-47.

**Booth**, A.D., 'The Chronology of Jerome's Early Years,' *Phoenix* 35 (Toronto, 1981) 237-259.

**Botte**, Dom Bernard, *Ambroise de Milan: Des Sacrements, Des Mystères*, Sources Chrétiennes (Lyon, 1949).

**de Bruyn**, Theodore S., *Pelagius's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford, 1993).

**de Bruyne**, Donatien, 'La prologue inédit de Pélage à la première lettre au Corinthiens', *Revue bénédictine* 24 (1907) 257-263.

– 'Étude sur les origines de la Vulgate en Espagne', *Revue Benedictine* 31 (1919) 373-401.

**Burkitt**, Francis C., *Texts and Studies, 4.3: The Old Latin and the Itala* (Cambridge, 1896).

– 'Review of *Vulgatastudien*,' *JTS* 30 (1929) 408-412.

**Burton**, Philip, *The Old Latin Gospels : A Study of their Texts and Language*, (Oxford, 2000).

**P.H. Burton, J. Balserak, H.A.G. Houghton, D.C. Parker** edd., *Vetus Latina Iohannes: The Verbum Project, The Old Latin Manuscripts of John's Gospel*, (2007-2010): <http://www.iohannes.com/vetuslatina>

**Cain**, Andrew, *The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009).

- *Jerome's Epitaph on Paula : A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae*, (Oxford, 2013).



**Cavellera**, Ferdinand, 'Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épitres, et de l'Apocalypse,' *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1920) 269-292.

– *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son œuvre* (Louvain, 1922).

**Chadwick**, Henry, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1966).

**Chapman**, John, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908).

**Coffin**, Harrison Cadwallader, 'The Influence of Virgil on St. Jerome and on St. Augustine,' *The Classical Weekly*, vol. 17, no. 22. (Oxford, OH, 1924) 170-175.

**Courcelle**, Pierre, *Les Lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (Paris, 1943).

– *Recherches sur les Confessions de S. Augustin*, (Paris, 1950).

**Clark**, Elizabeth A., *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton, 1992).

**Corssen**, Peter, 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes', *ZNW* 10 (1909) 1-45.

**Dahl**, Nils, 'The Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters,' *Semeia* 12 (1978) 233-237.

**Duckworth**, George E., 'Classical Echoes in St. Jerome's Life of Malchus,' *The Classical Bulletin*, vol. 24 (Cincinnati, 1947/48) 28-29.

**Dudden**, F.H., *The Life and Times of St Ambrose* (Oxford, 1935).

**Ehrman**, Bart D and M.W. **Holmes** edd., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (Leiden, 2012).

**Elliott**, J.K., *A Survey of Manuscripts Used in Editions of the Greek New Testament* (Leiden, 1987).

– 'The Translation of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, edd. H. Temporini and W. Haase, (Berlin, 1992) 246-265.

**Faller**, Otto, *De Fide, S. Ambrosii Opera Pars VIII* (Vienna, 1962).

**Fischer**, Bonifatius, 'Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache', *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 5, ed. Kurt Aland (Berlin, 1972) 2-92.

– 'Limitations in Latin in Representing Greek,' in B. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford, 1977) 362-374.

**Frede**, Hermann J., *Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses* (Freiburg i Br. 1966-71).

**Frolich**, Uwe, *Epistula ad Corinthios I* (Freiburg i Br., 1995).

**Geffcken**, Johannes, 'Antike Kulturkämpfe,' *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 29 (Leipzig, 1912).

**Gemeinhardt**, Peter, *Das lateinische Christentum und die antike pagane Bildung* (Tübingen, 2007).

**Glunz**, H.H., *History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon* (Cambridge, 1933).

**Godel**, R., 'Réminiscences de poètes profanes dans les Lettres de S. Jérôme,' *Museum Helveticum* 21 (Bern, 1964) 65-70.

**Grützmacher**, Georg, *Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie* (Leipzig, 1901-1908).

**Haelewyck**, J.-C. 'Le premières versions latines de la bible', *Les premières traditions de la bible*, edd. C.-B. Amphoux and J. Margain (1996) 121-136.

- *Evangelium Secundum Marcum*, fasc. 1 (Freiburg im Breisgau, 2013).

**Hagendahl**, Harald, 'Methods of Citation in Post-Classical Latin Prose,' *Eranos* 45. (Stockholm, 1947) 114-128.

– *Latin Fathers and the Classics*, University of Göteborg. (Göteborg, 1969).

– *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, University of Göteborg. (Göteborg, 1967).

– 'Jerome and the Latin Classics,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 28 (Leiden, 1974) 216-227.

**Harvey**, Paul B., 'Jerome Dedicates His 'Vita Hilarionis'', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 59 no. 3 (Leiden, 2005) 286-297.

**Houghton**, H.A.G. *Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts* (Oxford, 2008).

– & **Mellerin**, Laurence, 'Introduction,' *Studia Patristica* 54.2, edd. Houghton, Mellerin, and M. Vinzent (Leuven, 2013) 3-11.

- *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to Its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford, 2016).

**Jülicher**, Adolf, with Walter **Matzkow** and Kurt **Aland**, *Itala: Das Neue Testament in Altlateinischer Überlieferung*, 1-4 (Berlin, 1972).

**Hritz**, John N., *Saint Jerome: Dogmatic and Polemical Works*. (Washington, DC 1965).

**Kamesar**, Adam, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible*, (Oxford, 1993).

**Kelly**, J.N.D., *Jerome*, (London, 1975).

**Knust**, Jennifer Wright, 'New Testament, Latin Translations of', *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, edd. R.S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen, C.B. Champion, A. Erskine, and S.R. Huebner (2012) 4767-4769.

**Kunzelmann**, Adalbero, 'Die Chronologie der Sermones des hl. Augustinus,' in *Studi Agostiniani, Miscellanea Agostiniana*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1931) 417-520.

**Lagrange**, M.J., *Critique Textuelle* (Pendé, 1935).

**Laistner**, Max Ludwig Wolfram, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe AD 500 to 900*, (Ithaca, 1931).

**Lapidge**, Michael, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford, 2006).

**Labriolle**, Pierre, 'Le songe de Jérôme,' *Miscellanea Geronimiana*, (Rome, 1920) 227-235.

**Linde**, Cornelia, *How to Correct the Sacra Scriptura? : Textual Criticism of the Latin Bible Between the Twelfth and Fifteenth Century*, Medium Aevum Monographs XXIX, (Oxford, 2012) 95-97.

**MacCulloch**, Diarmaid, *A History of Christianity* (London, 2009).

**McGurk**, Patrick, "The oldest manuscripts of the Latin Bible", *The Early Medieval Bible*, ed. R. Gameson (Cambridge, 1994) 1-23.

**Metzger**, Bruce M., *The Text of the New Testament* (Oxford, 1964)

- *The Early Versions of the New Testament: The Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford, 1977).

- *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford, 1987).

**Mierow**, Charles Christopher (trans.) and Thomas Comerford **Lawler** (introduction and notes), *The Letters of St. Jerome* (Westminster, Maryland, 1963).

**Moulton**, J.H. and W.F. **Howard**, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* vols. 1-3 (Edinburgh, 1921-9).

**Nautin**, Pierre, 'Etudes de chronologie hiéronymienne (393-397),' *REAug* 18. (Paris, 1972).

**Parker**, D.C., *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, (2008).

**Palanque**, J.R., *Saint Ambroise et l'empire romain* (1933).

**Plater**, William Edward and Henry Julian **White**, *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford, 1926).

**Quasten**, Johannes, *Patrology* (Utrecht, 1950).

**Quentin**, H., 'Mémoire sur l'établissement du texte de la Vulgate', *Collectanea Biblica Latina* 6, (Paris, 1922).

**Raby**, F.J.E., *A History of Christian Latin Poetry: From the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1927).

**Rawson**, Elizabeth, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, (London, 1985).

**Rebenich**, Stefan, 'Jerome: The *Vir Trilinguis* and the *Hebraica Veritas*,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 47.1 (March, 1993) 50-77.

—*Jerome*, Routledge. (London, 2002).

**Rice**, Eugene F. Jr., *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore, 1985).

**Rotelle**, John E., *The Works of Saint Augustine* (New York, 1990).

**Rychlewska**, Ludwika, *Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1971).

**Sackville**, L.J., *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century* (York, 2011).

**Scheck**, Thomas P., *St Jerome Commentary on Matthew* (Washington D.C., 2008).

**Scherbenske**, Eric, 'The Vulgate Primum Quaeritur' in *SP* XLIV (Leuven, 2010).

— *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum* (Oxford, 2013).

**Sheerin**, David J., 'Turpilus and St. Jerome in Anglo-Saxon England,' *The Classical World*, vol 70, no 3 (Baltimore, 1976).

**Skutsch**, Otto, *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford, 1985).

**Souter**, Alexander, *Text and Canon of the New Testament*, (New York, 1913).

—'Notes on Incidental Gospel Quotations in Jerome's Commentary on St. *Matthew's* Gospel,' *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. 42 (1941) 12-18.

**Steinmann**, Jean, *Saint Jérôme*. trans. Ronald Matthews (London, 1959).

**TeSelle**, Eugene, 'Rufinus the Syrian, Caelestius, Pelagius: Explorations in the Prehistory of the Pelagian Controversy' *Augustinian Studies* 3 (Philadelphia, 1972) 61-95.

**Thierry**, J.J., 'The Date of the Dream of Jerome,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (Leiden, 1963) 28-40.

— 'Some Notes on Epistula XXII of St. Jerome,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 21 (Leiden, 1967) 120-127.

**Turner**, N., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* vol. 3: Syntax, (London, 1963).

**Tyson**, Joseph B., *Marcion and Luke-Acts* (South Carolina, 2006).

**de Vaan**, Michiel, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages* (Leiden, 2008).

**Vessey**, Mark, 'Jerome and Rufinus' ch 28 in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* ed. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, Andrew Louth (Cambridge, 2004).

**Veyne**, Paul, *Quand notre monde est devenu chrétien* (Paris, 2007).

**Vinzent**, Markus, *Christ's Resurrection in the New Testament and the Making of the New Testament* (Farnham, 2011).

- Meister Eckhart, *On the Lord's Prayer* (Leuven, 2012).

- *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (Leuven, 2014).

**Vogels**, H.J., *Vulgatastudien. Die Evangelien der Vulgata untersucht auf ihre lateinische und griechische Vorlage* (Münster, 1928).

**von Soden**, H., *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin, 1910).

**Weber**, Robert et al., *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* (Stuttgart, 1969).

**White**, H.J. *see Plater*.

**Wiesen**, David, *St. Jerome as a Satirist: A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters* (Ithaca, 1964).

**Williams**, Megan Hale, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago, 2006).

**Wordsworth**, John and Henry Julian **White**, *Nouum Testamentum Latine* [Oxford Vulgate] (Oxford, 1889).

**Wright**, F.A., *Jerome: Select Letters* (Cambridge, MA, 1933).

**Young**, Frances, 'Classical genres in Christian guise; Christian genres in classical guise,' *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, Andrew Louth (Cambridge, 2004) 247-258.